

The Slavic and East European Journal

New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII), No. 3

Fall 1960

CONTENTS

Gor'kij's Relations with the Bolsheviks and Symbolists	Irwin Weil	201
The Technique of Dream-Logic in the Works of Dostoevskij	Temira Pachmuss	220
Scientific Linguistics and Russian Grammars	Morton Benson	243
What Should a Russian Major Know?	Nathan Rosen	251

REVIEWS

Dmitrij Tschizewskij, <u>Formalistische Dichtung bei den Slaven, and Zwei russisch-kirchenslavische Texte, and Johannes Holthusen und Dmitrij Tschizewskij, Versdichtung der russischen Symbolisten: Ein Lesebuch</u>	V. Setschkareff	258
Peter Yershov, ed., <u>Letters of Gorky and Andreev, 1899-1912</u>	Filia Holtzman	260
A. M. van der Eng-Liedmeier, <u>Soviet Literary Characters: An Investigation into the Portrayal of Soviet Men in Russian Prose, 1917-1953</u>	Gleb Struve	261
Eugene Zamiatin, <u>We</u> , tr. Gregory Zilboorg	V. Terras	264
Astrid Baecklund, <u>Personal Names in Medieval Velikij Novgorod, I: Common Names</u>	Edward Stankiewicz	264
Kazimierz Bulas and Francis J. Whitfield, <u>The Kościuszko Foundation Dictionary, Vol. I: English-Polish</u>	Z. Folejewski	267
Uriel and Beatrice Weinreich, <u>Yiddish Language and Folklore: A Selective Bibliography for Research</u> . . .	Edward Stankiewicz and Archer Taylor	268

Dennis Ward, <u>Russian Pronunciation: A Practical Course</u> ; Thomas F. Wagner, <u>The Russian Alphabet</u> ; Nicholas Maltzoff, <u>Pattern Drills in Russian</u> , and <u>Russian Reading and Conversation</u> (2nd ed.); George Z. Patrick, <u>Elementary Russian Reader</u> , revised Ludmilla A. Patrick; Mario Pei and Fedor I. Nikanov, <u>Getting Along in Russian</u> ; and N. C. Stepanoff, <u>Say It in Russian</u>	Morton Benson	270
Noah D. Gershevsky, <u>Scientific Russian Reader: Selected Modern Readings in Chemistry and Physics</u>	Thomas F. Wagner	274
Leon Stilman, <u>Graded Readings in Russian History: The Formation of the Russian State</u>	Robert F. Byrnes	275
A. P. Okladnikov, <u>Ancient Population of Siberia and Its Cultures</u>	Viktor Kõressaar	275
Roman Ilnytskyj, <u>Deutschland und Ukraine, 1934-1945: Tatsachen europäischer Ostpolitik, I-II</u>	John P. Pauls	277
Negley Farson, <u>The Lost World of the Caucasus</u>	Natalie Chorna-Menges	278
Brief Notices		279
Books Received		285
NEWS AND NOTES		288

Editor

J. T. Shaw, Indiana Univ. (Bloomington)

Associate Editors

Morton Benson, Univ. of Pennsylvania
Edward Stankiewicz, Indiana Univ.
Walter Vickery, Indiana Univ.

Review Editor

Felix J. Oinas, Indiana Univ.

Editorial Committee

Victor Erlich
Zbigniew Folejewski
William E. Harkins
The Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, S. J.
Claude P. Lermieux
Horace Lunt
Oleg A. Maslenikov

J. B. Rudnyćkyj
Anthony Salys
Thomas A. Sebeck
Gleb Struve
Nicholas Vakar
René Wellek

Business Manager

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

"THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA"

is the new Summer 1960 issue of

DAEDALUS

Journal of the American Academy
of Arts and Sciences

Contents

- | | |
|---|--|
| RICHARD PIPES | LEOPOLD H. HAIMSON |
| <i>Foreword to the Issue</i> | <i>The Solitary Hero and the Philistines</i> |
| MARTIN MALIA | MAX HAYWARD |
| <i>What Is the Intelligentsia?</i> | <i>The Thaw and the Writers</i> |
| LEONARD SCHAPIRO | DAVID JORAVSKY |
| <i>The Pre-Revolutionary Intelligentsia and the Legal Order</i> | <i>Soviet Scientists and the Great Break</i> |
| BORIS ELKIN | GUSTAV WETTER |
| <i>The Russian Intelligentsia on the Eve of the Revolution</i> | <i>Ideology and Science in the Soviet Union: Recent Developments</i> |
| RICHARD PIPES | BENJAMIN SCHWARTZ |
| <i>The Historical Evolution of the Russian Intelligentsia</i> | <i>The Intelligentsia in Communist China</i> |
| LEOPOLD LABEDZ | JULIAN MARIAS |
| <i>The Structure of the Soviet Intelligentsia</i> | <i>The Situation of the Intelligentsia in Spain Today</i> |
| DAVID BURG | |
| <i>Observations on Soviet University Students</i> | |

Plus

DOCUMENTS—Philosophy and the Natural Sciences in the USSR—A Report of a Conference on the Philosophical Problems of Science. Moscow, 1958.
—“Dr. Zhivago”: Letter to Boris Pasternak from the Editors of *Novy Mir*.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY PRESS, PUBLICATIONS OFFICE MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

- ☐ Please enter my subscription to *DAEDALUS* as follows:
.....1 yr. \$4.50 2 yr. \$8. 3 yr. \$11.50
- ☐ Please send only the issue “The Russian Intelligentsia” @ \$1.25.
.....Payment herewith Bill me

Name

Address

(Add 50¢ per year for any subscription going to addresses outside the United States and Canada)

SEE

MOUTON & CO. • PUBLISHERS • THE HAGUE (The Netherlands)

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

1. Eng-Liedmeier, A.M. van der: SOVIET LITERARY CHARACTERS. An Investigation into the Portrayal of Soviet Men in Russian Prose, 1917-1953. 176 pp. Cloth. \$4.50
2. Durnovo, N.: OCHERK ISTORII RUSSKOGO JAZYKA. (Photomechanic Reprint) 384 pp. Cloth. \$6.50
3. Donchin, G.: THE INFLUENCE OF FRENCH SYMBOLISM ON RUSSIAN POETRY. 242 pp. 7 ills. Cloth. \$6.50
4. Milada Součková: THE CZECH ROMANTICS. 168 pp. Cloth. \$4.00
5. Schooneveld, C. H. van: A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE OLD RUSSIAN PRETERITE SYSTEM. 183 pp. Cloth. \$6.50
6. Westfall, S.: A STUDY IN POLISH MORPHOLOGY. The Genitive Singular Masculine. 419 pp. Cloth. \$13.00

Please send your order to your bookseller or to the above address.

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

The only American journal concentrating in research in the humanities and pedagogy in the field; articles, reviews, news and notes

Published by the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL) through the facilities of Indiana University

Subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL for individuals. Subscription-membership: \$5.00 per year; \$2.00 for undergraduate and graduate students

Members will receive, through an arrangement with the Indiana University Slavic and East European Series, two bonus volumes during 1960:

Avraham Yarmolinsky, *Literature Under Communism: The Literary Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin* (1960)

The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1959

For subscriptions, advertising rates, and back numbers, write to Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the AATSEEL,

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

"The outstanding general journal of modern language teaching in the United States"

THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

brings to its readers every month stimulating and helpful articles on methods, materials, pedagogical research, publications and textbooks in the field.

Edited by J. Alan Pfeffer, The University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. Published by the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations.

Eight issues a year, monthly except June, July, August, and September. Current subscription \$4.00 a year. Foreign countries, \$4.50 a year net in U.S.A. funds.

Sample copy on request

The Modern Language Journal

Stephen L. Pitcher, Business Manager

7144 Washington Avenue
ST. LOUIS 30, MISSOURI

A Wide Choice of Textbooks—Teaching Aids

for study of **RUSSIAN** by non-Russian students regularly used
in middle school and colleges in the **USSR**

**LATEST EDITIONS of ENGLISH-RUSSIAN and RUSSIAN-ENGLISH
DICTIONARIES (new orthography)**

GEOGRAPHICAL ATLASES and MAPS

**Inexpensive editions of Russian CLASSIC WORKS used by most
American schools for students' reading assignments**

TALKING PHONOGRAPH RECORDS
acts from plays — monologues

Excellent for students' practice study in pronunciation

Ask for our **TX 60 Catalogue**

Four Continent Book Corp.

822 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Phone: GR 3-2018

Typewriters in Russian and Other Languages

New and reconditioned machines available . . . Portables
and office size . . . Also other
business machines.

**ALL LANGUAGES TYPEWRITER
CO.**

Dept. SE
119 W. 23rd St., New York 11, N.Y.
CHelsea 3-8086

A New and Important Book

BEGINNER'S BOOK IN RUSSIAN

As A Second Language

Series 1

A unique contribution in meeting the
greatly increasing need for an effective
introduction and approach to
the teaching of the Russian language:
Edited by Helen B. Yakobson, Head
of the Slavic Department, George
Washington University, Washington,
D.C.

Recommended For:

**ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY SCHOOLS
COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES
ADULT EDUCATION CLASSES**

PRICE \$2.75

(10% Discount on 10 or more copies)

Publishers:

**Educational Services
1730 Eye St., N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.**

Announcing the new . . .

Basic Russian — Book II

By Mischa Fayer

For second-year high school classes. Is a sequel to the widely used Basic Russian, incorporating all of the popular features of that text: controlled building of vocabulary; interesting illustrated narratives; a wealth of exercise material, including conversational drills. In Book II many of the narratives focus on Russian culture and historical figures. A complete teacher's manual is available.

New titles now available:

Advanced Conversational Russian by Nicholas Maltzoff

Designed for advanced conversational classes. There are ten conversational lessons and five debates. Each conversational lesson is supplemented by a vocabulary and a list of assignments.

Workbook for Basic Russian by Mischa Fayer

The workshop is integrated chapter by chapter with Basic Russian to provide a uniform method for studying each unit. Supplementary exercises are included.

Tests for Simplified Russian Grammar

A series of eight four-page objective tests covering the subject matter in Simplified Russian Grammar.

Write for your complete catalog

Pitman Publishing Corporation

2 West 45th Street, New York 36, New York

GOR'KIJ'S RELATIONS WITH THE BOLSHEVIKS AND SYMBOLISTS

By Irwin Weil

Brandeis University

In the complex relations between Russian political issues and Russian literature from 1895 to 1936 no man played a more continuing and prominent role than Aleksej Maksimovič Peškov, the writer who adopted the pen name Maksim Gor'kij, "Maksim the Bitter." His early short stories introduced into Russian literature the barefooted tramp, a figure who raucously cursed the behavior of most of Gor'kij's compatriots. Many of his readers thought these curses rose from the primitive, unspoiled voices of the common people who seemed ready to burst into Russian cultural life with the vigor necessary for the defeat of Tsarist oppression. So successfully did Gor'kij's early stories assail the national faults which were occupying the attention of the Russian intelligentsia that his popularity for a short time even rivaled the acclaim given L. N. Tolstoj. Between 1899 and 1904, over 416,000 copies of Gor'kij's works were published,¹ an unheard of figure at the beginning of the twentieth century. The widespread interest in the figure of Gor'kij spurred almost every political and literary faction to deal in its own way with this new type of Russian author, the self-educated man, ostensibly of lower-class origin.² The public, almost quasi-official interpretations of Gor'kij became so prominent and insistent at the time he was writing that they gained some control over the writer himself. Relatively early in his career he started manipulating the personality of "Gor'kij" the writer, as if this were in some way distinct from the real person, Aleksej Maksimovič Peškov. He was very conscious of the role he played in the eyes of Russia, and his works made extensive and open use of the author's public persona.

This persona was continually modified by Gor'kij, who was constantly trying to adjust to many conflicting opinions among the factions competing for Russian intellectual allegiances.

Although Gor'kij sometimes complained about the fact that he was considered an "ethnological phenomenon,"³ he assiduously contributed to the formation of his public image as a proletarian writer. He wore affectedly simple dress (his *rubaska* became his trademark), and used publicly crude language: "Čort tebja voz'mi!"⁴ Gor'kij is supposed to have answered a Bishop who reproved him for his swearing. His role as a revolutionary imposed upon him behavior overlaid with affectation, but it also forced him to keep hidden what he would have preferred to speak out. He sometimes refrained from public statements, at the price of great inner turmoil, because the statements might have been construed as counter-revolutionary, or in the words of Gor'kij [as quoted by Xodasevič], "They would have spoiled the biography."⁵

Evidence that Gor'kij's private feelings were not always in accord with the public self-image he fostered can be found among his lengthy correspondence with some of the Russian Symbolist poets. In refusing a request by Valerij Brjusov to contribute a piece to *Severnye Cveti*, a periodical miscellany put out by the Symbolist "Skorpion" publishing house, Gor'kij heaps scorn upon those who would write a beautiful Symbolist literature while the Tsarist government was forcing radical students into the army:

My state of mind is like that of a mad dog which has been beaten and put on a chain. If you, sir, are interested not only in ancient inscriptions, Cleopatras, and other antiquities, if you love me — I think you will understand me.

Don't you see, I feel that to force the students to be soldiers is a foul deed, a shameless crime against the freedom of the individual, an idiotic measure by scoundrels gluttoned with power.

My heart is boiling, and I would be happy to spit in the dirty mouths of these haters of mankind who will be reading your *Severnye Cveti*...

... I feel inexpressible anger at everybody... even at Bunin, whom I love; but I don't understand why he doesn't take his beautiful talent and shape it into a knife to stab where one should.⁶

Gor'kij's anger really arises from two motives. He is, as he says, angry at Brjusov, a poet not entirely bereft of revolutionary sympathies, for bothering about Severnye Cveti at such a time. Gor'kij is, however, also angry at himself; in the same letter he admits that his writing talent has at least temporarily deserted him: "You can see, Brjusov, from The Three of Them, that I simply cannot write."⁷ That Gor'kij had some awareness of the internal conflict causing his difficulties, is clear from an earlier letter to Brjusov: "You will not like my piece, one, because it is badly written; and, two, because it is written on a social theme."⁸ Gor'kij writes as if Brjusov is the one who proscribes politics in literature, but the air of discomfort in the letter betrays its writer's fear: the poor quality of his novel may demonstrate the validity of Brjusov's proscription. It is hard to escape the conclusion that the proletarian writer is trying to assign a completely political motivation to an anger which is partly the result of a literary frustration.

These private doubts were a great torture for Gor'kij during the first decade of the twentieth century, after he had ceased writing short stories about the barefooted tramps and was seeking the proper form for the Marxist revolutionary novel. The general reading public, however, had little notion of his discomfort; as far as they were concerned, he remained characterized by a symbol which he himself had created, the famous burevestnik ("stormy petrel"). The idea of Gor'kij as the revolutionary stormy petrel was widespread not only among the Russian radicals. Governmental fear of the writer's power to arouse disloyal public opinion is vividly shown by the writing of N. Ja. Steč'kin, a Tsarist apologist:

Gor'kij is a rotting bubble on the indecency of contemporary thought, the poisoner of youth's clean passion. . . .⁹

It would be impossible to see in Gor'kij an agent and messenger of the Free Masons and the Jews, logically carrying out his clever and well-constructed assignment of indecent revolutionary indoctrination, but the entire sum of his literary achievements gives this unlikely supposition a shade of a certain kind of credibility.¹⁰

With what surprise and consternation did Tsar Nikolas II and his apologists receive the news that the Imperial Russian Academy of Sciences had elected to membership in its literary section none other than Gor'kij, a man who had been arrested by the political police. No doubt the Tsar ruminated sadly on the extent of subversive activities within his government. He decided to block the appointment of Gor'kij to the Academy, only to see his action precipitate a public uproar which further solidified the public position of the stormy petrel.

Nowhere was this reaction more pronounced than among Russian liberals who were disgusted by the crude governmental propaganda against Gor'kij and the Tsar's high-handed action. Even those liberals who did not agree with Gor'kij politically were delighted to support him in this case; it was an exhilarating opportunity to back a serious artist against the Tsarist regime. Čexov and Korolenko, older writers who had extended a helping hand to the young Gor'kij, resigned from the Academy in protest.¹¹

In spite of the liberals' friendly activities on his behalf, however, Gor'kij himself much preferred the Rossijskaja Socialističeskaja Demokratičeskaja Robačaja Partija, which offered, he thought, enough political action to satisfy his ardor for reform. He was among its early Russian sympathizers and quickly became one of its most famous adherents. But in spite of his great desire to identify himself with the social actions of the Bolshevik faction and release his reformist energies through their program, he soon ran into difficulties. The ideological strictures of Marxist activism soon cramped his restless artistic imagination; but Gor'kij grimly hung on to his Marxist belief and Marxist public label. The Bolsheviks, for their part, realized they had an uncomfortable literary ally on their hands. At the same time, however, they knew full well how much the association of his famous name with their movement could help the Russian Marxist cause; they were willing to go to considerable lengths to retain his allegiance.

Lenin in particular appreciated the advantage of a Bolshevik Gor'kij, and the party chief decided very early that the advantages far outweighed the difficulties for the Bolsheviks. He also valued Gor'kij highly as a personal friend. As much as possible he tried to keep Gor'kij out of the endless internecine disputes among the Bolsheviks, and he

allowed the writer as much ideological leeway as he could, on the apparent assumption that it was worth straining Bolshevik orthodoxy a bit to retain the prestige associated with the famous writer. Before the revolution Lenin often patiently and good-humoredly tried to ease Gor'kij back to the Bolshevik path after the latter had strayed ideologically. Their pre-Revolutionary correspondence between Capri and Paris was frank and often agitated, but never did Lenin apply the hot blast of his polemic power against his friend. There was often considerable wit and kindly warmth in Lenin's statements to and about Gor'kij; the wit was never the biting sarcasm which Lenin and Trockij used against many socialists whose ideological deviations were no worse than Gor'kij's.

It is a sad feeling you get, reading this statement [by Gor'kij] which is shot through with popular philistine prejudices. It has often happened to me to be with Gor'kij on Capri and to warn him and chide him about his political mistakes. Gor'kij would parry these reproaches with his inimitably dear smile and with his sincere declaration: "I know that I am a bad Marxist. And, you know, all we artists are somewhat irresponsible people." It is not so easy to argue against this.

Why, then, should Gor'kij get involved in politics? . . .

To try to speak reasonably with the present Russian Government [as Gor'kij was urging] is like preaching a sermon on virtue to the keeper of brothels.¹²

After the revolution, however, Lenin's patience wore thinner. Harassed by the herculean tasks of administering the young Soviet state, Lenin found it harder and harder to maintain good relations with Gor'kij who was very critical of the Bolsheviks' shortcomings and who repeatedly interceded for people arrested by the Cheka. As pleased as the Bolsheviks had been when Gor'kij had pointed out the Tsarist mote, they were not at all happy when he spotlighted the Soviet beam. They still wanted Gor'kij's name, but they were finding him an increasingly difficult burden to bear. In 1920 Lenin despairingly told Gor'kij (as reported by Zamiatin): "It's time for you to learn that politics is in general a dirty affair, and it would be much better for you not to get mixed up with it."¹³ Apparently it was the execution

take a direct part in the construction of a new culture.¹⁸

The thinly veiled sneers of Majakovskij and the state of genteel desperation expressed by the above editorial are very typical of the eventually successful pressures put on Gor'kij in the 1920's to return to Soviet Russia.

One might well ask why the Soviet leaders were so anxious to preserve the image of a Bolshevik Gor'kij and why they so assiduously cultivated his role in the development of Soviet literature. That they should have remained so officially involved with an ally whose real loyalties were never unambiguous is at first puzzling, keeping in mind the Soviet mania for "monolithic" loyalty. Gor'kij, after all, was by no means the only Russian writer of considerable skill who lent his pen to the Soviet new order after the Revolution. There was a warm personal friendship between Gor'kij and Lenin, but the latter seldom let personal friendship stand in the way of Bolshevik interests. As for the well-advertised "friendship" between Stalin and Gor'kij, it had more in common with a marriage of convenience than with a love match.

One of the most important reasons for the Soviets' continuing interest can be found in two themes from Gor'kij's writing, whose combination is as if ready made for Bolshevik purposes: an unremittingly harsh view of the cruelty in pre-Revolutionary Russian life and a beautified description of an ideal world which exists somewhere outside man's everyday experience. The former is exemplified in "Čelkaš," the story which gained wide and early popularity for Gor'kij in 1895; the latter is perhaps most clearly and simply stated in the fable "The Yellow Bird Who Lied" (1893). These two themes exist throughout almost all of Gor'kij's writings virtually side by side; neither destroys the other nor diminishes its vividness. This combination was very welcome to the pre-Revolutionary Bolsheviks, since they too had a harsh vision of the social reality around them and wanted to elicit men's hopes with a vision of the classless society, a political ideal which would exist sometime in the future.

The swiftness of action and ruthless will power of the smuggler Čelkaš were qualities obviously welcome to the party of Lenin when the Bolsheviks were planning a revolt within a state controlled by the class enemy. But the discipline necessary to be a Bolshevik would be no more

acceptable to a Čelkaš than to his creator. Those Marxists who had hoped that Gor'kij's tramps might represent a social group ready for Marxist action were soon disillusioned. This did not prevent them, however, from emphasizing and admiring in "Čelkaš" certain qualities in the protagonist; his imperturbable skill in evading Tsarist law enforcement, and his almost uncanny ability to exploit the weaknesses of the inferior peasant for a clearly defined tactical goal.

In Gor'kij's fable the yellow bird who lied ignored the bitterness of everyday life which Čelkaš saw. The bird sang beautifully and brashly about a wonderful land which existed somewhere beyond the borders of the homeland. His singing was good enough to absorb the attention of the birds around him, but his impertinent "lie" was publicly deflated by a respectable woodpecker. The sympathies of the author are clearly with the bird who gives his fellow birds hope, and Gor'kij deals sarcastically with the woodpecker "lover of truth." The yellow bird is last seen pathetically ostracized, still protesting that he only wanted to give pleasure. Gor'kij's allegory of the yellow bird exemplifies Gor'kij's attraction to illusions which soothe, just as "Čelkaš" showed his ability to deal with harsh reality when he so wished. Both Gor'kij's reiterated fondness for the open lie if it gave comfort to the listener,¹⁹ and his admiration for the strong person who could recognize and manipulate comforting falsehoods for his own ends provided the Bolsheviks with literary material which suited their revolutionary needs. Before the revolution they were happy to accept Čelkaš's contemptuous and superior view of the conventions of Russian life and the yellow bird's ecstatic song about their own ideal. After the Revolution, it was more difficult for them to tolerate the Čelkaš point of view which obviously sympathized with the "brigands" who were resisting the rules of Soviet life and who were making it more difficult to portray the U. S. S. R. as the workers' paradise. At this stage the Bolsheviks decidedly preferred to emphasize the yellow bird image of the happy society which was to come.

The Bolsheviks were happy to use the artist's vision of the unhappy Russian world as a representation of Tsarist reality and the yellow bird's bright world as the future Socialist reality. But they were not so happy about his characterization of the bright world vision as a "lie." The Bolsheviks, after all, believed that they were promulgating the

one and only true version of human intellectual and social progress and could hardly be expected to view their future Utopia as a baseless illusion; Gor'kij, on the other hand, saw these beliefs as illusions, and as illusions which were very useful, indeed necessary, to his art. Since this art was precisely what the pre-revolutionary Bolsheviks wanted from him, they were in no position to proscribe his use of "lying" political illusions. The eventual post-revolutionary resolution of this problem for Gor'kij lay in the development of Soviet concepts about "Socialist realism" and "Revolutionary romanticism," to which he himself contributed a great deal. The concepts themselves were not meant to apply specifically only to the works of Gor'kij; they do, however, focus on the two separate moods in his work, and they categorize them in a way acceptable to the Soviet literary ideologists. The notion of Revolutionary romanticism was applied both to the passages describing the lyrical paradise and to the nobly rebellious qualities of the individualistic rebels in Gor'kij's work. The term realism denoted those aspects of his work which dealt with the ugly side of everyday Russian life. The Bolsheviks considered the "romantic" aspects of Gor'kij's work as exhortative material for working revolutionaries and would-be comrades. The yellow bird's lying was acceptable, for his song about paradise would inspire others to work toward its actual creation. The opponents of the Bolsheviks might object that a false dream is just as likely to be used for blinding men to bad actions as for inspiring them toward good ones; this demur only re-emphasizes why Gor'kij's fiction was so useful for the revolutionaries. His juxtaposition of the attractively imagined goal with bleak reality made the revolutionary dream, true or false, a welcome relief from the repressions suffered in pre-Revolutionary Russia. Gor'kij was unmoved by his critics' arguments that the eagerness of the Bolsheviks to use mendacious visions from his writing might imply that their political visions of a perfectly just society were also lies. What was important, as far as Gor'kij was concerned, was for men to have cherished goals in whose fulfillment they believed; only such a credo, he thought, could lift them out of the morass in which they foundered. If the Bolsheviks offered this possibility, illusory though their program might be, more power to them!

But is it not a waste of imaginative power, man's highest

and most noble quality, to spend one's literary creativity on political problems instead of the more profound and human questions of life and death? So argued Gor'kij's fellow writers, many of whom thought that too much Russian literary energy had already been devoted to goals which were almost entirely political and social, and that too little attention had been given to esthetic problems. In the first decade of the twentieth century, the most prominent Russian advocates of this opinion were Gor'kij's direct literary opponents, the Symbolists. Given their point of view, one would expect them to exercise their formidable polemical abilities in the fierce kind of argument recorded so often in the history of Russian literature from 1830 to 1917. Such conflicts only rarely occurred between Gor'kij and the Symbolists. While the latter maintained no such thing as a rigid "party line" on the subject of Gor'kij, they almost always muted their attacks on him.

Perhaps the ambivalence of the Symbolist reaction to Gor'kij is best typified in an article by Andrej Belyj: "We are not his partisans, but we must remain admirers of much that is in his work."²⁰ Belyj argues that Gor'kij has arrived at a form of artistic truth which must be taken seriously, in spite of the fact that it is mixed with a great deal of political dogmatism. There are moments of genuine literary inspiration, according to the symbolist poet, when Gor'kij leads his protagonists into vostorg nochj ("ecstasy of night"),²¹ and these spurts of literary creativity are considered too precious to be ignored. Belyj finds no need to counterpoise Gor'kij's harsh description of Russian realities with soothing dreams; indeed, the revolutionary writer's black view of Russian daily life is welcomed by the poet, who considers it an artistically powerful perception, one which cuts through the social conventions which hide the cruelties among human beings. The more desolate Gor'kij's picture of Russian life became, particularly in the series of stories about the dull provincial town of Okurov, the more the Symbolists saw in his work the proper appreciation of the human soul's dark sides which so interested them. It was his Marxist illusions of the ideal life which they found so stultifying. Many of the Symbolist writers themselves achieved an artistic balance in their writing between an apocalyptic vision of everyday reality around them and an idealized life whose existence was posited in their writing. Their ideal was a creation of

the poetic imagination and transcended the bounds of the material world; they wrote of a far-off realm which only the superior poet's vision could transmit to ordinary mortals. That Gor'kij should be satisfied to base his artistic ideal on an essentially political cause, the triumph of the Revolution, seemed to them an ignoble denigration of the artist's role, a subordination of the artist's dream to a non-esthetic reality. They believed, in short, that the poet should leave politics to the politicians. Their disagreements with Gor'kij's stated artistic goals did not prevent many of the Symbolists, however, from sympathizing with his "words about Russia": "In any event, Gor'kij is far from us. He is a representative of another literary group which is in many ways opposed to Symbolism. But we take his words about Russia closer to heart than the quasi-populist cries that the sun shines brighter in our sad land than the tropics."²²

Belyj's reluctance to attack unequivocally a clearly defined literary opponent stands in marked contrast, as stated before, to the usual bitterness of pre-Revolutionary literary and political arguments. In part this may have been out of consideration for a person who was fighting publicly the worst aspects of the Tsarist regime; very few of the Symbolists wanted to hear themselves called "reactionary."²³ They experienced, moreover, some embarrassment in attacking a likable man who was also a personal friend to many of them.²⁴

The main reason, however, for the poet's failure to attack Gor'kij unequivocally lies in another direction: the Symbolists considered themselves men of high sophistication, and they were rather bewildered by the problem of criticizing the work of an artist from the people. Ellis, a Symbolist critic somewhat more hostile to Gor'kij than was Belyj, shows some critical consideration for "impressions of vagabond wanderings": "M. Gor'kij was not without interest while he threw out his coincidental impressions of vagabond wanderings with fresh and crudely colorful tones. The best of these impressions sometimes achieved the clarity and richness of the 'flamandes' of E. Verhaeren."²⁵ Having made this concession, Ellis then feels free to express his disapproval of Gor'kij's work when he abandons the short stories about the tramps and attempts more pretentious forms of literature. But the grounds of Ellis' attack show up the critic's sense of his own disadvantage: the argument concentrates

less on the specific weaknesses in Gor'kij's novels than on the cultural level of the writer himself. Gone was Gor'kij's "native soil," claimed Ellis, when the proletarian writer tried to transfer his works to a larger canvas. He was barred from the boundaries of the "eternally beautiful," as he was not a cultured person; he had "not personally lived through . . . all the diseases . . . all the poisons . . . of the complex whole,"²⁶ which makes up artistic culture.

According to Ellis, Gor'kij had irretrievably separated himself from the realm of the true literary artist; by emphasizing his non-cultural background and upbringing, Gor'kij made it impossible for the Symbolists to recognize him as a bearer or creator of culture. Ellis's article goes to the crux of how Symbolist critics viewed Gor'kij's work. Whether they were sympathetic or hostile, all of them concentrated on his personality and his fictional protagonists as representatives, links to a world different from the domain of cultured, literary men.

To a certain extent, the Symbolist "banishment" of Gor'kij from the world of culture came about because they felt banished from his world. Gor'kij's characters symbolized a class and a realm close to the violent social ferment from which they felt personally estranged. In many cases this feeling of estrangement was a source of acute discomfort, since some of the Symbolists anticipated the imminent Russian national upheaval as an event analogous to the fearsome and apocalyptic visions in their writings. In Gor'kij they saw a link between the unlettered Russian people who were in the midst of this upheaval and the Russian men of arts. The esthetic critics did not want Gor'kij to become cultured in their own fashion, for if he did so, he would lose his value as a "link."

The clearest expression of this "populism" (*narodnichestvo*) among the Russian Symbolists is shown in the writings of Blok, who was also the Symbolist most friendly to Gor'kij. Blok was often fascinated by a certain kind of virtue and purity which he found in Gor'kij's constant remonstrations against the social evil in Russian life. Blok was never sure that he understood Gor'kij's literary aims completely, but he greatly admired Gor'kij's eternal readiness to fight the good fight and always cherished his friendship with the revolutionary writer. Though a contributor to *Vesny* Blok later became a member of the Znanie publishing house²⁷ after

the demise of the Symbolist magazine. Even before joining *Znanie* he assumed the burden of defending Gor'kij to more sophisticated intellectuals; the grounds Blok chose for making his argument are very close to the core of Belyj's and Ellis's arguments: "Gor'kij has the kind of sincerity which is simply impossible for people of great culture like Merežkovskij and Filosofov."²⁸

Two years later in the same publication Blok wrote: "The last troubled appearance on the line connecting the people with the intelligentsia was the appearance of M. Gor'kij. He asserts once more that what he loves and how he loves is fearfully and largely unknown to us. . . . We all love one thing, but with a different kind of love. Perhaps he has an antidote to the debilitating poisons of our love — 'healthy blood.'"²⁹ Blok was no happier than Belyj or Ellis with the political clichés in Gor'kij's work, but he delivered more pointed warnings about the dangers for the intellectuals if they rejected the revolutionary writer, thereby breaking the line connecting themselves with the people. According to Blok, they could do so only at their extreme peril.

Merežkovskij, like Blok, had very strong feelings about Gor'kij as a representative Russian phenomenon, but for opposite reasons. Merežkovskij was the most hostile to Gor'kij among all the Symbolists; this peculiarly religious poet felt that Gor'kij's work represented the evil force in the Russian people which, if unrestrained, would destroy all that was good in the nation and culture.³⁰ Merežkovskij, unlike the other critics, saw no need for a literary analysis of Gor'kij's writings: "Generally," he said, "the poetry of the bosjak [barefooted tramp] calls to mind Smerdjakov with a guitar. . . ." ³¹ He claimed that attention must be given to the writer "from the bottom" of society solely because of the dangerous forces which Gor'kij's characters embodied. Yet, after reading Merežkovskij's fearful and impassioned descriptions of Gor'kij's characters, it is difficult to avoid the distinct impression that they have impressed themselves firmly on Merežkovskij's literary imagination. Gor'kij's characters played on Merežkovskij's deepest fears that a half-cultured class of people would arise and overthrow all of European culture and religion in the name of the "Man-God," the "superman." In his customarily churning style of literary criticism, Merežkovskij posits a "metaphysical ladder"

leading from the writings of Gor'kij to a melodramatic plot for the elimination of the real Christ:

Mankind without God, man against God, man is God, I am God — this is the series of propositions and conclusions, the series of steps which form a metaphysical ladder still unclear to the consciousness of the Russian intelligentsia, a ladder which inevitably goes from a religion of mankind to a religion of man's divinity. . . .

The true Christ, the God-man, imperceptibly becomes a man only as a man: "everything is in man, everything is for man"; then, opposed to Christ, comes the man-God: "man lives for the sake of a better man," i. e., for a superman who has not yet come but will come.³²

Merežkovskij himself took Gor'kij's presumed closeness to the people even more seriously than did the other Symbolists: he could not accept it as a positive phenomenon in the way the others did, because the poetic nightmare of his own private *Götterdämmerung* was made so frighteningly vivid by Gor'kij's characters.

As opposed as the evaluations of Gor'kij's writing were among the various Symbolists, they all based their conclusions about his work on the assumption that he was an important link between themselves and the common people. Gor'kij's prominent Bolshevik associations could not fail to make them uneasy, for the Symbolists were strongly opposed to the idea of literature as the handmaiden of politics. Yet, with the exception of Merežkovskij, they were all willing to forgive his obsessive concern with politics in literature, in the hope that he would provide them with a direct approach to the increasingly restless Russian people.

Since 1895, when Gor'kij gained widespread fame as a writer, there have been several generations of Russian critics who have regarded Gor'kij primarily from a social or political point of view. These critics have ranged from politicians to estheticians, from the general Russian reading public to Gor'kij's literary masters. Many critics with highly developed literary taste have read his fiction as a "link" with the Russian people, almost a national cultural resource for writers desiring a better opportunity "really to know" their compatriots. Generally, both the esthetically

oriented critics and the politically radical commentators fell into the same trap in evaluating Gor'kij's writing. Both sides took at face value Gor'kij's social role as a man of the people. His fictional protagonists were taken by both sides almost entirely as representatives of a social or economic class, a part of the social and economic contemporary history of their country rather than products of Gor'kij's literary imagination.

The Russian critics were, of course, responding to Gor'kij's portrait of himself and his political activities by which he hoped to shock and change his compatriots. Yet he himself was inevitably shocked and hurt when such a person as L. N. Tolstoj regarded him as a kind of "ethnological phenomenon." Gor'kij was early forced to learn the sad lesson that trading on his public personality inevitably led to other people's use of it for their own purposes. While Gor'kij protested against this more than once, his own psychology as a writer seemed almost to demand it. His involvement with the Bolsheviks seems to stem partly from the same need,³³ for whenever Gor'kij exercised the artist's impulse to shake himself free, he became engaged in a vain attempt to construct a grandiose movement of his own. After the inevitable collapse, he always came back as if driven. Indirectly aided by the negative reactions of the political conservatives, the Bolsheviks gave him the sense he required of ultimately purposeful action. Uneasy as Gor'kij was about the narrowness and sometimes bigoted nature of their approach, he wrote a great deal in his fiction specifically to please the Bolsheviks. This material is uneven in quality — some of it has the peculiarly effective bite which Gor'kij managed to work into his scornful denunciations of smug Russian citizens; some of it is tendentious to such an extreme that it is reduced to wearisome didacticism.

Gor'kij was, however, also deeply impressed by the arguments of the many able Russian literary critics of his day. One of his most endearing qualities as a man and a writer was his unaffected humility when his own writing was being judged by critics whose literary tastes he felt he had good reason to respect. This held particularly true for the Symbolist poets, whom Gor'kij admired highly for their poetry and tried to emulate with would-be poetry of his own. He soon realized that he simply did not have the talent of a poet, but this did not prevent him from injecting a good deal of poetic symbolism into his prose work. It should not be

assumed, of course, that Gor'kij did this only to please his Symbolist readers. That his temperament had some inclination in this direction is shown by the words of Čukovskij, an able Russian critic who knew Gor'kij and his work well:

Once Gor'kij got the idea of listening to a series of lectures on the history of philosophy, but he hardly got to Empedocles when he could not listen any more. After the very first words he grew tired, as this lecture had called to his mind so many fantastic pictures and apparitions. . . .

Tortured by this mad dance of images, he understood that philosophy was not for his temperament.³⁴

But just as he never felt completely satisfied with the radical political approach to literature, neither did the Symbolist approach give him what he wanted.

Vacillating back and forth, beset by political forces from all sides, desirous of playing a noble social role in the Russia of his day, Gor'kij maintained the public attitude epitomized in his pen name "bitter": he was angry at the social injustice which he saw in front of him, and he was bitter at himself for failing to find a satisfactory literary expression of his feelings. He never ceased castigating the faults of his countrymen, and he conceived of his own position as one outside the milieu he criticized. The reader almost never catches in his fiction even a slight suggestion that he himself might have some doubts about the didactic nature of his calling. Along with this bitter moral self assuredness, however, Gor'kij experienced great doubts about the programmatic philosophies which he tried to assimilate into his writing. Indeed, his moral condemnations were so sweeping and his hopes for improving men so grandiose that it was virtually impossible for any ideology to survive the kind of test to which Gor'kij had to subject it. He wanted his writing to result in nothing less than a complete moral transformation of men. With his writer's antennae ever-sensitive to the social evils of the life around him, he found it impossible to avoid the evidence that his efforts were not successful. He continued searching for the system which would, after all, produce the long-sought moral transformation and indicate to him that he had found the proper forms for his goals as a writer. Both the Symbolists and the Bolsheviks seemed so sure of their approaches, the former travelling on a road to the universal principle of beauty, the latter riding the wave

of inevitable historic progress! How Gor'kij envied their intellectual certainty!

An American critic writing fifty years after these events and over twenty years after the death of Gor'kij, to whatever degree he may suffer from being removed in time and in culture from the author, has the advantage of being able to treat Gor'kij's published fiction as literary creations, not completely circumscribed by contemporary historical events. This man's bitterness and crudity may intrigue us now as a writer's stance; it no longer has the power to shock us as a political phenomenon.

Notes

1. N. JA. Steč'kin, Maksim Gor'kij (S.-Peterburg: Tipolitografija V. V. Komarova, 1904), p. 3.
2. Gor'kij actually carried the passport of the merchant class, one step above the lower class but without much distinction in Russia. His maternal grandparents, the Kaširins, raised him in circumstances which were materially comfortable while he was a young child. Gor'kij himself, however, always played the public role of a man from "the bottom" of society. Na dne ("On the Bottom," English version: The Lower Depths) was the play which brought Gor'kij international fame.
3. M. Gor'kij, Sobranie sočinenij (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Xudožestvennoj Literatury, 1951), IV, 260.
4. Literally, "The devil take you!" In Russian this curse has a force more vulgar than its English direct translation, slightly less vulgar than "Go to hell!"
5. V. Xodasevič, Nekropol'-Vospominanija (Brussels: Les Editions Petropolis, 1939), p. 273.
6. Letter from Gor'kij to Brjusov, February 5, 1901, from "Pis'ma Maksima Gor'kogo k Valeriju Brjusovu," Pechat' i revoljutsija, 1928, No. 5, pp. 56-57. I do not treat Brjusov's comments together with the other symbolists later in the chapter, because Brjusov's revolutionary sympathies brought about a special relationship with Gor'kij.
7. Ibid., p. 56.
8. Letter from Gor'kij to Brjusov, November 26, 1900, *ibid.*, p. 55.
9. Steč'kin, p. 229.
10. Ibid., pp. 235-236.
11. They could not, however, persuade L. N. Tolstoj to join them.
12. This was part of a series of articles which Lenin wrote in 1917 from Zurich for the Bolshevik newspaper Pravda, then

coming out in Petrograd. The series is entitled "Pis'ma iz daleka" ("Letters from Afar"), and this one was written [but not published] on March 12 (25), 1917. V. I. Lenin, Sočinenija, XX (Moscow: Partijnoe izdatel'stvo, 1935), 41-42. It was actually published in 1924, when Gor'kij was living outside the U.S.S.R.

13. E. Zamjatin, "Maxime Gorki," La Revue de France, 1936, No. 15, p. 520.

14. This incident was particularly embarrassing for Gor'kij, because Gumilev was a literary opponent: Gor'kij was thus open to the charge of collaboration with the murder of a literary rival.

15. V. Majakovskij, Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, I (Moskva: Gos. Izdat. Xud. Lit., 1955), 23. According to the story, Gor'kij had spoiled Majakovskij's vest with tears aroused by hearing part of "A Cloud in Trousers."

16. V. Majakovskij, "Letter to the Writer A. M. Gor'kij," Novyj Lef, No. 1, January 1927, pp. 2-6. "Learn, turn! Or do you want to live like Šaljapin, smeared by over-perfumed applause? . . . Aleksej Maksimovič, can you still see from behind your windows the soaring falcon? Or have the snakes, whom you created, started to make friends with you?" The latter is a reference to Gor'kij's allegory Song of the Falcon (1895), which had contrasted the soaring falcon to the crawling snake.

17. No. 5, 1928.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

19. Xodasevič, *op. cit.*, has an interesting essay on Gor'kij in which he carefully compares the writer's own views with those of Luka, the character who soothes all the tramps with illusory hopes in Na dne.

20. A. Belyj, "Na Perevale," Vesy, 1908, No. 9, p. 60.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 62.

23. It should be noted, however, that Vesy, 1909, No. 9, pp. 72-82, contained an article, "Štempelevannaja kul'tura," which was essentially an anti-Semitic diatribe, under the signature of Boris Bugaev, the real name of Andrej Belyj. The burden of the article is an accusation against the alien, rootless Jews (*sic!*), who have so powerfully infiltrated into all the positions of cultural power and who are preventing the national genius of the Russian people from flowering in the field of culture. Bugaev, of course, denies that his article is anti-Semitic. The fact that Vesy was willing to risk the political label of "reactionary" in relation to anti-Semitism makes it seem less likely to me that they were afraid of the same label if they would attack Gor'kij.

24. Cf. personal letters between Gor'kij and the symbolists, M. Gor'kij: Materialy i issledovanija, I (Akademija nauk SSSR, 1934), 185-205.

25. Ellis (pseud. for Kobylinskij), "Ešče o sokolax i užax," Vesy, 1908, No. 7, p. 53.

26. Ibid., p. 55.

27. In a letter to Andreev written in the spring of 1912, Gor'kij defends himself against the charge of inconsistency on account of Blok's presence in "Znanie." Maksim Gor'kij: Materialy i issledovanija, I, 167.

28. A. Blok, "O realistakh," Zolotoe runo, 1907, No. 5, p. 63.

29. A. Blok, "Rossija i intelligencija," *ibid.*, 1909, No. 1, p. 82.

30. One also senses Merežkovskij's fury that Gor'kij should have the audacity to call himself a religious man.

31. D. Merežkovskij, Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, II (Moskva: Vol'f, 1911), 41.

32. Merežkovskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 50, 64.

33. This should not be misconstrued as an attempt to impugn the sincerity of Gor'kij's political protest or an attempt to fit all phenomena into a framework of psychological determinism. It would be absurd to deny the actuality of most of the social abuses Gor'kij was fighting.

34. K. Čukovskij, Dve duši Maksima Gor'kogo (Leningrad: Izdat. A. F. Marks, 1924), p. 48.

THE TECHNIQUE OF DREAM-LOGIC IN THE WORKS OF DOSTOEVSKIJ

By Temira Pachmuss

University of Illinois

The purpose of this study is to examine the technique of dream-logic, one of the artistic devices which Dostoevskij applied in his endeavor to cast light on the spiritual essence of his heroes, their inner life, and their subconscious. Dostoevskij's choice of subject-matter — that is, the underlying inconsistencies of the human soul and its struggle to find its highest expression — influences his artistic method to a large extent. He is forced to use special artistic techniques in dealing with those psychic regions where mind and intuition are in constant contact with higher spiritual realities.

Let us examine the way in which Dostoevskij presents the fundamental conflict, the disparity between objective reality and man's subjective experience. The writer projects himself into the minds of his characters and identifies himself with their particular world. With his ability to comprehend their inner life, he sees how little their conception of reality corresponds with the objective world. He shows the constant efforts of man to assert his own view of reality and to dismiss the world around him as an illusion and impossibility. Dostoevskij in his works extensively exploits the confusion between these two realms. "We almost always see reality as we want to see it," Dostoevskij writes, "as we, in a preconceived way, want to interpret it to ourselves."¹ His opinion is that "we prefer to believe in miracles and impossibilities rather than in truth and reality, which we do not want to see."²

The writer maintains that this clash between objective reality and man's subjective conception is responsible to a large degree for the painful split in the souls of his characters. The portrayal of this disharmony is fundamental to Dostoevskij's approach as a novelist, and can be seen already in his earliest works. In Poor Folk, Makar Devuškin flees

from depressing reality into the more pleasant world of his imagination. Although poor and despised by society, he goes to endless pains to give the impression that he possesses sufficient means for a prosperous life. In an attempt to delude his neighbors with regard to his poverty, he even drinks tea, a luxury which he is in no position to afford. When destitute, he makes desperate efforts to convince himself and Varen'ka that the situation is not so deplorable as it seems; but he himself admits that life appears tolerable to him only when seen through rose-colored glasses. He imagines himself to be madly in love with an actress whom he has never seen. The letter to Varen'ka in which he relates the story of this love is pathetic in its expression of his desire to escape reality. He goes so far as to buy some scented soap and perfume for his unseen beloved, and hires a carriage to pass by her windows in the manner of a man of the world. As he is too poor to sustain this illusion, he finally has to return to reality, but even then he tries to delude himself by playing the part of a flippant playboy. "Finally I ceased to love her," he writes to Varen'ka, "I grew tired of her." His struggle against reality appears more poignant when he informs Varen'ka of his impressions of Gogol's The Greatcoat. Identifying himself with the hero, Akakij Akakievič, Devuškin is indignant with Gogol' for having let Akakij Akakievič suffer as he did. Had he himself been the author of this story, he writes to Varen'ka, he would have pointed out Akakij Akakievič's virtues, which Gogol' failed to do; he would have punished the evil and rewarded the good. In other words, he would have substituted a pleasant dream for painful reality. It is important to note that, although Devuškin's tendency to flee from real life into the world of imagination is quite obvious, the whole representation remains realistic, and Devuškin can always distinguish objective reality from his own world of fancy.

The struggle against reality is also depicted in The Double. Here, however, a positive line of demarcation is rarely made between the objective world and the subjective conception of the individual. The irrational element comes forward and plays tricks with reality. The influence of the German romantic, E. T. A. Hoffmann, whose works Dostoevskij read with enthusiasm at the Military Academy in St. Petersburg, can be observed here. Content, manner, and technique all reveal some similarity to Hoffmann's works,

especially to Die Elixiere des Teufels. In Hoffmann's Gothic tale of horror the underlying theme is the incompatibility of everyday reality with human ideals. The phenomenon of schizophrenia is very well presented in the split personality of the monk Medardus. While the spiritual part of his personality is longing for love and purity, he sees his own ego in the abhorrent devil of his double, and succumbs to vice, sensual pleasures, and crime. In The Double there are also traces of Gogolian grotesque naturalism. In contrast with Medardus' gruesome and terrible life, the predicament of Gogol's official Kovalëv in The Nose represents an extraordinary experience, almost sheer nonsense. He comes upon a part of his ego which was lost to him — his nose — which is now transformed into another human being with the rank of state councilor. Although both the gruesome element of Hoffmann's artistic form and Gogol's ironic attitude are present in Dostoevskij's The Double, they are kept in the background, while the subconscious and irrational sphere of the human soul becomes the center of his interest. The tradition of his romantic predecessors is transformed into a forceful dream-logic with a consistency which, apart from The Double, seems to be found only in the works of Franz Kafka.

D. Čyževskij, in his study of the problem of the Doppelgänger in Dostoevskij's work, particularly emphasizes Dostoevskij's artistic skill in combining unadorned realism with the means of mystification: "... Dostoevskij's style is built on the intermingling of naturalistic and irrational elements. The humdrum and commonplace elements of life are amazingly interlaced with fantastic elements . . . prosaic striving toward reality with ecstatic clairvoyance . . . Dostoevskij's artistic force lies in the fact that these elements are not simply intermingled, but entwined artistically and so permeated with one another that they constitute an organic unity."³ R. E. Matlaw, in his illuminating study "Structure and Integration in Notes from the Underground,"⁴ also points out Dostoevskij's great skill in interlacing "naturalistic" representation with elements transcending the bounds of reality: "Dostoevskij's style and his narrative method consist of an interpenetration of 'naturalistic' and metaphysical elements. He introduces real events and philosophical speculations as two facets of the same subject, frequently . . . presenting a naturalistic explanation concomitantly with a

mystic one."⁵ This artistic skill permits Dostoevskij to leave doubts in the mind of the reader and hero alike as to the line of demarcation between hallucination and reality. Subjective accounts of the hero's delusions alternate with objective descriptions of the physical environment; and the boundary between the realms of hallucination and reality is almost entirely obliterated.

The technique by which Dostoevskij sustains the illusion of the double and the subtlety of his insight into the deranged mind of Goljadkin are impressive indications of the artistic skill of the young author. In spite of the Hoffmannesque element — the juxtaposition of dream life and real life — the central theme of The Double seems realistic throughout. As in Poor Folk, the underlying idea is the suffering of the human being humiliated in real life and his attempt to create an imaginary world to which he can retreat from his trials and anxieties. However, while Devuškin does not confuse day-dreams and reality, Goljadkin tries to make his futile dreams come true. An insoluble conflict between reality and imagination rages in his mind. The whole struggle is woven into an intricate and superb frame of dream-logic, revealing the great artistic skill of Dostoevskij.

The technique of dream-logic plays a very important part in Dostoevskij's artistic method in exploring the irrational depths of the human soul. The "logic" of the dream implies a peculiar causal connection inherent in dreams, which appears essentially alogical in man's waking state. It lacks the characteristics of rational causality and removes the boundary between the world of objective reality and the world of imagination. The events presented by the technique of dream-logic convey the impression of irrationality, and elements from the realm of the subconscious take on the appearance of objective reality. It is through this technique of dream-logic, which obliterates the causal and temporal relationships existing in the world of objective reality, that Dostoevskij depicts the irrational element in man's mind.

The utilization of the dream technique was already to be found in the poems of Tjutčev, very much influenced as he was by the German Romantics, in whose conceptual framework dreams played an important part. The interest in the split personality, insight into the dark recesses of the human soul, rejection of surrounding reality and escape into the realm of imagination and of the irrational mind were within

the thematic range of the literary works of such German writers as Jean Paul, Novalis, E. T. A. Hoffmann, to some extent Friedrich Hölderlin, and other writers of the Romantic period. The dream, the hallucination, and the psychological framework already present in German Romanticism on all levels — literary, epistemological, and metaphysical — attain greater depth and wider application in the works of Dostoevskij. In addition, he employs dream-logic as an artistic device more uniformly and consciously.

The technique of dream-logic is extensively used in The Double. Goljadkin seeks to belong to the beau monde, but he is aware that a pliant, modest, and meek character would be more in keeping with his frugal means. Therefore he is resolved to overlook all that which is rebellious, evil, and conniving in his own nature. However, as he cannot disavow the existence of all these characteristics, he ascribes them to his non-existent double. At the office Goljadkin's conduct has always been appropriately humble and pliant. Now, however, he is firmly determined to assert his real ego and change his daydreams, originating in his real character, into reality. This seems to be the main thesis of Dostoevskij in The Double. He considers that the world which is commonly perceived by the senses, the rational world, or objective reality, is not real, since people always see reality as they want to see it, as they want to interpret it to themselves. This conviction of the writer finds its artistic expression in Goljadkin's experiences. His colleagues know him as a humble clerk, "who likes to efface himself and slink away in the crowd." This Goljadkin, however, is not the real Goljadkin; he exists only in the minds of his colleagues. Previously he made his conduct conform to their preconceived opinions of how a person of his social standing should behave. He has simply adjusted his character to his situation in life, but he is earnestly resolved to be courageous and lay claims to what he considers his human rights. Naturally enough, Goljadkin's ambitions do not conform to the notions of reality held by his superiors. The question which Dostoevskij is posing here seems to be: What is reality? Is it their conception of Goljadkin, or his own conception of himself? The impact of these two conflicting conceptions of reality is conveyed in masterly fashion. On the one hand, Goljadkin is unable to comprehend the refusal of his superiors to receive him at a dinner to which he imagines he has been invited; and on the other hand, his superiors

are unable to understand Goljadkin's impertinence in forcing his way into a party where he is not wanted. Neither, according to Dostoevskij, represents what Powys⁶ and others frequently term "real reality." This reality lies in the irrational sphere of Goljadkin's mind. Dostoevskij very graphically brings out the conflict: the struggle of Goljadkin's character, with its urge for self-assertion, and his notion of reality, shaped by the subconscious awareness that he must adjust his nature to the notion of reality held by others.

Dostoevskij likens Goljadkin's irresistible urge for self-assertion to a spring: "Goljadkin dashed forward as though someone had touched a spring in him . . ." "Moved by the same spring which had sent him dashing into the midst of a ball uninvited, he stepped forward." This and similar references stress Goljadkin's irresistible impulse to relinquish his false ego and assert the real one. In this respect the scene on the stairs of the home of councilor Berendelev, Goljadkin's one-time benefactor and patron, appears particularly significant. Goljadkin, convinced of the infallibility of his own notion of reality — which is actually a mere projection of his daydreams — and determined to insist on his appropriate place in society, becomes aggressive. He takes a step forward, while Andrej Filippovič, his immediate superior, jumps back, stupefied at the sight of this new and unknown Goljadkin, who does not correspond in any way to Andrej Filippovič's own idea of his employee. "Goljadkin mounted the stairs more rapidly, and Andrej Filippovič, still more rapidly, darted into the apartment and slammed the door after him," as though symbolically retreating into his own world and eliminating his impertinent subordinate. He is not concerned with the question of whether this resolute conduct manifests the real or the unreal Goljadkin. He is merely anxious to retain his own world, formed in accordance with his conception of reality, and exclude from it anything which does not harmonize.

Goljadkin sees with despair that whichever of his two characters is true, the two conceptions of reality — his own and that of others — are incompatible. This appears to him to be the cause of his failure. After a little thought, he decides to pursue his plan further by cunningly forcing his way to the dinner party through the back entrance. On the landing of the back stairs of Berendelev's apartment, he contemplates the panorama of glittering uniforms and medals,

of sparkling wines and aromatic cigars, of the lily-white shoulders and elegant figures of beautiful women. Such a brilliant and sumptuous spectacle has perhaps never appeared to Goljadkin even in his most daring dreams! To stress its splendor and undoubted effect on poor Goljadkin, Dostoevskij resorts to the device of pleading his complete inability to convey all the radiance and magnificence of this dinner. "Oh, if I were a poet," he laments, "I should certainly have painted all that glorious day with a free brush and brilliant colors! . . . I should describe, then, how Andrej Filippovič, adorned with the medals that well befit his grey hair, rose from his seat and raised above his head the congratulatory glass of sparkling wine, a wine more like heavenly nectar than plain wine and brought from a distant kingdom to celebrate such occasions!"

The conception of reality held by Andrej Filippovič and other dignitaries, however, reserves a very minor place indeed for Goljadkin. Dostoevskij conveys this vividly by showing the brilliant party taking place without Goljadkin, although he is present there. "He is also there," Dostoevskij explains, "that is, not at the party, but almost at the party." The following scene, devoid of any glitter or magnificence, constitutes a sharp contrast with the previous brilliance. "Goljadkin is standing huddled in a cold, dark corner which is partly hidden by a huge cupboard and an old screen, in the midst of rubbish, litter, and odds and ends of all sorts . . . watching the course of proceedings as a mere spectator." This position seems to be characteristic of Goljadkin's position in life. Driven once more into the background, he feels with profound pain his seclusion from the society which he so much admires. The place where he now stands is being used for storing rubbish. This is symbolic of Goljadkin's idea of his own position in life since he feels himself to be unwanted and entirely worthless. Andrej Filippovič and the others do not notice him standing there any more than they notice him in everyday life, for they belong to a different world. In their world he can participate only as an outsider, as a spectator. Finally he overcomes this feeling of depression and enters the ballroom, possessed by the thought that his rightful place is in this society, but suddenly there comes the awful realization that it is all a mistake. He does not belong there, he feels out of place. As in the scene with Krestjan Ivanovič, all Goljadkin's

attempts to appear defiant, self-confident, and complacent fail, and his behavior again betrays him. "On the way he jostled against a councilor and trod on his foot, and accidentally stepped on the dress of a very venerable old lady and tore it a little, pushed against a servant with a tray and then ran against somebody else." He realizes to his despair that, as his presence at the party does not agree with the conception of reality held by others, he will not be able to realize his ideal. With the loss of his own idea of reality, he can no longer find his way in life. He has not been able to assert his true ego, and now he cannot distinguish real from unreal. His world of fantasy and hallucination supplants the world of objective reality, and he has but one desire — to give up all claims to this reality and flee. "There is no doubt whatever that, without blinking an eye, he would have happily sunk into the earth . . . "

Goljadkin's complete derangement finds its artistic expression in his confusion at the party, with events and impressions rapidly crowding through his mind. His mental disturbance reaches its peak when he is pushed out onto the cold and dark landing of the stairs. Now, deprived almost entirely of his ability to recognize objective reality, "he feels that he is falling headlong over a precipice." After his disgraceful defeat, his only concern is to escape the reality with which he has failed to cope, and to which others have expected him to adjust his nature. He cannot arrange his whole life according to their requirements and adapt his notion of the world to theirs. From a reality which appears to him painful and unjust, he retreats into an unreal world, into a region of fantasy and the impossible.

The gloomy scene following Goljadkin's headlong flight from reality as others see it reflects the strange and uncanny experiences of his own soul. "It was an awful November night — wet, foggy, rainy, snowy . . . the wind howled in the deserted streets. It lifted the black water of the Fontanka above the mooring rings of the river bank, and irritably brushed against the lean lamp-posts. The thin, shrill creak of the lamp-posts chimed in with the howling of the wind. In the stillness of the night, broken only by the distant rumbling of carriages, the howl of the wind and the creaking of the lamp-posts, there was the dismal sound of the splash and gurgle of water. . . . There was not a soul, near or far . . . " With these details Dostoevskij intensifies Goljadkin's state

of despair and perplexity. Now he strives to flee from his real ego, or even to destroy it completely. "He wanted to hide from himself, as though he were trying to run away from himself! Yes! It was really so. One may say more: Goljadkin did not want to escape from himself. He wanted to be obliterated, to cease to exist, to return to dust."

It is in the midst of this agony, while relinquishing the subconscious self with "a feverish tremor running through his veins . . . and possessed by a strange feeling of obscure misery," that his double appears before him. Dostoevskij likens Goljadkin's sensations at this moment to "those of a man standing at the edge of a fearful precipice, while the earth is opening beneath him, shaking, moving, rocking for the last time, falling, drawing him into the abyss . . ." He has longed to free himself from his ambitious and vain ego, which has brought him nothing but suffering, but even after the fulfilment of this longing, he has no respite from his panic and agony, for now his double appears before him. Goljadkin's split personality assumes very sharp outlines, and the two men — Goljadkin himself and his double — encounter each other as two separate human beings. This double has all the evil tendencies of the old Goljadkin, and stands before him stronger than ever, for now Goljadkin has no control over it. In danger of losing the last remnants of his peace and self-confidence, he fights desperately against Goljadkin junior, his double, now his greatest enemy. Losing this battle, he tries again and again to reconcile himself with his double, to become one man. But all his endeavors fail! He refuses to see Goljadkin junior as the incarnation of his own character, preferring to consider him an entirely separate human being, who merely has a striking similarity to himself. He would rather live in a world of "miracles and impossibilities" than admit the truth about himself. Finally his imagination plays him one last trick. The illusion of being loved and respected by society, being reconciled with everybody, even with his tormentor, the double, is granted to him for one brief moment. His daydream is thus converted for him into reality for an instant, and thereafter this same reality crushes him completely.

With great artistic skill, Dostoevskij shows in this dream Goljadkin's distress at the clash between his conception of reality and the surrounding world. Here, Goljadkin finds himself in the company of some educated and noble people

who like him and esteem his personality. This vision of the triumph and glory produced by his conception of reality is suddenly destroyed by his double. Goljadkin junior, the embodiment of the traits which Goljadkin senior wishes to suppress in himself, " . . . succeeds in proving clearly that Goljadkin senior is not the genuine one at all, but the sham, and that he, Goljadkin junior, is the real one . . . " Thus, in this dream Dostoevskij suggests that the double, the phantom existing in Goljadkin's imagination, represents reality, while Goljadkin himself remains only a vision, a product of his fantasy. It also follows from this dream that Goljadkin's repressed nature is the cause of the subsequent collapse of his conception of reality. This collapse becomes a clear manifestation of the anxiety and neurosis that are preying on his mind. His double — harboring Goljadkin's covert ambitions — urges him to go on living in a manner appropriate to his social standing, and convert his daydreams into reality. Had Goljadkin continued effectively to suppress his subconscious ego, as he had done previously, he would probably have escaped the painful collapse of his illusory world, which would have remained the source of his vitality until the end of his life. Goljadkin's dream, then, revealing his repressed nature, shows at the same time that, in this conflict between the conscious and unconscious in his character, the reality of his conscious ego is overwhelmed and rejected by his "subliminal ego" as a lie.

The final scene in the overcrowded drawing room in The Double is particularly significant in revealing Dostoevskij's powerful technique of dream-logic, which seems to efface all the causal and temporal relationships of the world of objective reality: "Our hero went into another room; he met with the same attention everywhere; he was vaguely conscious of the whole crowd closely following him, noting every step he took, talking in undertones among themselves of something very interesting, shaking their heads, arguing and discussing in whispers . . . Suddenly Goljadkin's name was called from the other room; the shout was at once taken up by the whole crowd. All was noise and excitement, all rushed to the door of the first room, almost carrying our hero with them . . . there was a general stir — something they had long been waiting for happened. 'He is coming, he is coming!' passed from one to another in the crowd. 'Who is it that is coming?'

floated through Goljadkin's mind, and he shuddered at a strong sensation."

The whole scene appears to be a dream, with its own inherent logical connection, throwing light on the psychic symptoms of Goljadkin's irrational ego. The technique of dream-logic, which enables Dostoevskij to sustain his unfortunate hero's vision of his double, shows that objective reality and Goljadkin's subjective world of reality ultimately become transformed into two irreconcilable entities: the actuality of Goljadkin's and its opposite, the actuality of the rest of the world. The irrational reality, superseding the rational, finally becomes for Goljadkin his sole world.

The contrast between the exact fixation of time and Goljadkin's lapses into timelessness is an astute device of the technique of dream-logic. It is a difficult task for the reader to determine the length of time between Goljadkin's first entry into the apartment of Berendeev and his final appearance there in a state of complete mental derangement. On the other hand, Dostoevskij gives the exact time that Goljadkin enters his own apartment and emphasizes his haste to leave it again by eight o'clock. These contrasts intensify the dream-like atmosphere, in which the objective world loses its reality through the elimination of the notions of time and space. The dream, in its turn, introduces dream-logic, which focuses the author's attention on the innermost recesses of Goljadkin's dual nature.

The Double remains the only work of Dostoevskij where this form of artistic expression is consistently maintained throughout. In none of his later works does dream-logic occupy such a predominant place; and nowhere does he transform the reality of his central character into a phantom to such an extent as to allow this phantom to dominate the whole situation. Now and then Dostoevskij returns to this artistic form, but — with the possible exception of The Landlady, where, as in The Double, the major conflict lies between the world of reality and the world of imagination into which Ordynov escapes — there is little difficulty in distinguishing reality from hallucination in his later works.

The criticism of Belinskij and other contemporaries, who disliked The Double, may be the reason for Dostoevskij's subsequent cautious and limited employment of dream-logic. This defeat must have been particularly painful to him because

he expected much from The Double.⁷ He now began to see another form of expression; but fragments of the artistic technique so consistently developed in The Double are found also in his later works, for example in Crime and Punishment. Here Dostoevskij sometimes removes the border between objective reality and Raskol'nikov's conception of reality, making dream and reality merge; and once more he voices his conviction that there is a tendency in man to see the objective reality as he wants to see it. Raskol'nikov, prior to his crime, sees his prospective murder as a heroic deed, "a duty toward humanity"; he sees himself as "an extraordinary man," almost another Napoleon. Yet, after his crime is committed, he begins to see things in a different prospective, as his previous understanding of reality slowly gives way to reality itself. Now he can no longer believe in the heroic motives of his murder. He realizes that he has murdered solely to satisfy his ambition and vanity. This truth is revealed to him through the unexpected encounter with the artisan who calls him a murderer. This mysterious man with "a morose, stern and discontented look" appears before Raskol'nikov, filling him with horror as he reveals the cruel truth that Raskol'nikov has so much feared. As if in a dream, his heart knows more than his mind, as Gogol's Danilo in The Terrible Vengeance says to Katerina: "You do not know the tenth part of all that which is already known to your soul." Petrified with fear, Raskol'nikov cannot efface from his memory this apparition with its smile of "cold hatred and triumph," an apparition which personifies his own guilty conscience. This dream-like revelation of reality is continued by his dream of another, fruitless attempt to kill the old woman. He is led to her by the same mysterious artisan, as if he were intent on pointing out once more to Raskol'nikov that he is only a murderer, far removed from his idol Napoleon.

Dostoevskij does not distinguish clearly the line of demarcation separating Raskol'nikov's waking state from the dream which follows. He does not even mention that Raskol'nikov fell asleep; he merely says: "He became oblivious; it seemed strange to him that he did not remember how he had got into the street." Yet the impression of the dream is conveyed by a few illogical observations cunningly woven into the realistic background. The imagery used is no longer concrete. Raskol'nikov's remark about the moon shining

through the window is an example. "This silence springs from the moon," he reflects, "it must be asking a riddle." A similar effect is also produced by the remark, "the more silent the moon was, the more violently Raskol'nikov's heart beat." When Svidrigajlov suddenly appears before him at the end of the dream, Raskol'nikov is not sure whether he is still dreaming and whether Svidrigajlov represents a real man or another apparition. He has never seen him before, yet he is aware of some incomprehensible likeness between them. Realizing their inner affinity, Svidrigajlov says to Raskol'nikov: "Well, didn't I tell you that we had something in common? . . . When I came in a few minutes ago and saw you lying with closed eyes, pretending to be asleep, I said to myself at once: 'This is the very same man!'"

In what respect is Raskol'nikov "the very same man"? What is the basis of their mutual understanding? Unlike Goljadkin's vision of his real ego, Svidrigajlov has an objective existence. He is a real human being. And yet he is as much Raskol'nikov's irrational being as Goljadkin's double is his. When he looks upon his real ego, Raskol'nikov loathes its repulsive nature, but the invisible thread connecting them is sustained throughout the novel. As if in a dream, he comes across Svidrigajlov when he has not the slightest idea where to look for him. Again, both of them acknowledge the fact of their inner likeness, their inner connection with each other. Throughout his life, Svidrigajlov's chief aim has been self-indulgence, and in striving to gratify all his desires he falls prey to perversions, which ultimately result in his guilty conscience. Like Raskol'nikov, he is no longer able to experience a passionate feeling of love or hatred. His life appears to him meaningless, devoid of any deep and genuine emotion. His appearance before Raskol'nikov emphasizes the warning previously sounded by the artisan: that Raskol'nikov will end up in the same spiritual impasse if he persists in living only for ambition and vanity. It is a final reminder that these are untenable as a basis for a life morality. Here, again, Dostoevskij shows that Raskol'nikov's conception of reality has misled him; it has compelled him to regard his ambitious striving for power and domination as heroic courage. Engrossed in his own conception, he has overlooked reality, overlooked his own real self, his subconscious, in the same way that Goljadkin did.

Within the realistic framework of Crime and Punishment,

Dostoevskij introduces elements of a technique which both contrasts and simultaneously merges dream-logic with reality. The approach in The Idiot is essentially different. Here Dostoevskij paints a great canvas of realistic detail but covers it as though with a veil of dreams. The technique of dream-logic shows itself mainly in the inter-relationship of the characters. They know the thoughts and feelings of others sufficiently to have a foreknowledge of their actions. For example, everybody present knows why Ippolit reads his confession and speaks his innermost thoughts, although he has not previously discussed these subjects. They all know beforehand that he will not shoot himself even though he is determined to commit suicide. The answer is frequently given before the question has been asked. When Ferdyščenko, requested at Nastasja Filippovna's birthday-party to relate the worst of his evil actions, tells the guests of the theft he has committed, he anticipates Prince Myškin's observation which subsequently comes true. The characters are seldom surprised by any unexpected event, for they appear to have a presentiment of all these happenings. Even though Aglaja's love for Prince Myškin has never been mentioned, all her relatives and friends are aware of it. Nastasja Filippovna, while living far away from St. Petersburg, has a knowledge of Aglaja's love for the Prince, but no indication is given as to how she could have possibly obtained this information. All the characters move and speak as if in a dream in which people appear and events happen with little logical coherence. Sometimes the heroes seem to have the power of foretelling the future. Nastasja Filippovna, Rogožin and Prince Myškin, all have a foreboding that Nastasja Filippovna will be murdered by Rogožin long before it actually happens. In a similar way, Prince Myškin knows that Rogožin contemplates murdering him.

However, in this novel, too, we find scenes in which, as in The Double or Crime and Punishment, dream merges with reality. Such is, for example, Rogožin's appearance before Ippolit, a scene which is strongly reminiscent of the first dream-like encounter of Raskol'nikov and Svidrigajlov. It is in a hallucination that Ippolit sees Rogožin entering his room at night, but Dostoevskij describes their meeting so realistically that not only Ippolit but even the reader himself begins to have doubts as to whether it is only an apparition. Ippolit is able to establish only the next morning that Rogožin

in the flesh could not have come in, as all the doors were locked at night. The question could be asked why no one but Rogożyn appears in Ippolit's hallucination. Unlike Goljadkin and his double, or Raskol'nikov and Svidrigajlov, Ippolit and Rogożyn are two quite different people. The author wants to show that Rogożyn is subjected to the same silent power of nature as Ippolit. Ippolit is being ruined through his illness; Rogożyn, through his passions. From this Ippolit draws the conclusion that not only he himself, but every living creature is affected by the seemingly meaningless domination of silent nature. This conclusion, in turn, fills his heart with a strong desire to have at least one triumph over the monstrous and absurd force, one action which comes entirely from his own free will.

A consistent development of Dostoevskij's earlier conviction that man is helplessly exposed to the pitfalls of the objective world, while he tries desperately to flee into his own world of imagination, is also evident in this novel. The theme of contrast between actual and subjective realities is further developed in the figure of General Ivolgin. He mitigates the painful impact of objective reality by lapsing into the world of his morbid imagination. Here Dostoevskij raises the question once more — What is reality? He says here that there is no clear definition of reality at all: "... almost every reality, even if it has its own immutable laws, nearly always is incredible as well as improbable. Occasionally, moreover, the more real, the more improbable it is."

In contrast to Shakespeare and other great playwrights who build their tragic effect to a large extent out of man's inability to cope with the situations in which he is placed, Dostoevskij makes the destiny of his characters dependent on man's subconscious "impulse of destruction." This feature of human nature finds its artistic expression in The Idiot, especially in the dream-like encounter of Prince Myškin and Rogożyn, who is armed with a knife. While he is intuitively aware of what could happen, the Prince feels himself irresistibly drawn toward the waiting Rogożyn. The dream-like impression is carried further by the Prince's fear of Rogożyn's glowing eyes, which repel and yet attract him at the same time. Instead of fleeing from Rogożyn, Prince Myškin visits him in order to convince him that he is neither his rival in love nor an enemy, but his loyal and loving friend.

But even while he seeks to divert him from thoughts of murder, Prince Myškin knows that his efforts will prove vain. Rogožin, although acknowledging his rival's friendship and brotherly love, and understanding his feeling of pity for Nastasja Filippovna, is still unable to master his urge to murder the Prince. After wrestling with his desire to avoid meeting Rogožin, the Prince finally succumbs to his still stronger yearning to see his friend as a murderer. His inner struggle to evade Rogožin's knife and yet to provoke in him his "urge for destruction," is conveyed by means of Dostoevskij's technique of dream-logic. With a distinct premonition of the imminent disaster, the Prince yields to the temptation of seeing reality as he wishes to see it. His exclamation, "Parfën, I won't believe it!" as Rogožin raises his knife, may signify Myškin's desperate will to replace unbearable reality with a more pleasant lie. In spite of the dream-logic in this scene, Dostoevskij does not forget to account for the Prince's clairvoyance realistically by introducing an epileptic attack during which he allegedly experiences moments of supreme knowledge.

Possibly encouraged by the success of The Idiot, Dostoevskij is less concerned with the likelihood of events in The Eternal Husband, a work which Alfred Bem designates as an "unfolded dream."⁸ In Bem's instructive interpretation, the real happenings which take place before the eyes of the reader are merely the dramatized visions of a morbid imagination. The dream did not merge with reality, as Velčaninov thought, but turned into visions, which he mistook for reality. According to Bem, the whole story is "a tragedy of conscience," "an idea of crime and punishment," the core of the tragedy being not an external punishment but an inner consciousness of and expiation for sin.

The artistic representation of The Eternal Husband resembles more closely that of The Double, but there is a considerable change in the technique of dream-logic. The baser passions of Goljadkin and Raskol'nikov are embodied in their alter egos, Goljadkin's in the person of his double, and Raskol'nikov's in the person of Svidrigajlov. In The Eternal Husband the guilty conscience of Velčaninov is incarnated in the person of Trusocky, who has no common characteristics at all with Velčaninov. In the beginning of the story, Velčaninov appears to be suffering from the painful memory of his past. Brooding over his previous life,

he lapses into a state of deep dejection. When he searches for the origin of his sudden anxiety and spiritual pain, he comes to the conclusion that it is all associated somehow with the inexplicable presence of a man with black crepe on his hat, a man whom he met by chance in the street some time ago. Velčaninov finds it impossible to connect his suffering in any logical manner with someone who is an apparent stranger, but the thought of him lingers in his mind. One night he is awakened from an obscure but tormenting dream by the loud ringing of the door bell. He rushes to the door, but there is no one there, and he finally convinces himself that it was only part of his dream. However his agitation keeps him from sleep. Wandering across to the window, he sees his enemy down below, standing on the other side of the street, peering across at his house. Although Velčaninov does not even hear his steps, he knows that the stranger is coming to him, and divines his every movement through the closed door. It appears to Velčaninov that his dream has melted into reality, though he still cannot grasp the whole meaning of this mystery. Flinging the door open, he faces his nocturnal visitor. This dream-like encounter, which is the projection of Velčaninov's irrational ego, finds its realistic foundation in the following scene. Trusocky, the man with crepe on his hat, is neither a phantom nor a dream, but the husband of a woman with whom Velčaninov had a clandestine love affair some nine years before. This intrusion of Trusocky may imply that only in his dream can Velčaninov find the courage to acknowledge the reason for his guilty conscience. The symbolism of dreams is one of Dostoevskij's favorite expedients for the artistic expression of his thoughts and convictions in allegorical form. Frequently these dreams represent symbolically the philosophical idea underlying the work in question.⁹ The scope of this essay, however, does not allow a detailed analysis of dreams, which depict the most significant stages in the spiritual development of his heroes. His skilful achievements in this sphere deserve further special study.¹⁰

While in The Idiot and The Eternal Husband Dostoevskij concentrates mainly on the psychological issues, the philosophical implications become predominant in The Possessed. In his preceding works Dostoevskij seems to have entered into the minds of different people and seen the world around them from their point of view. He seems to have identified

himself with their experiences and thoughts. In The Possessed Dostoevskij appears rather as an observer of events and people who symbolize certain ideas. The human "impulse of destruction," represented in The Idiot chiefly in its psychological aspect, is considered here more or less from the philosophical point of view. The irresistible power of the "impulse of destruction" becomes the core of Dostoevskij's concern and artistic expression. Stavrogin, the central character, who appears as an individual in the rational context of the novel, seems at the same time to personify evil as such on a symbolical level.

Stavrogin's nocturnal visit to Šatov and Kirillov, his faithful disciples, once more illustrates Dostoevskij's employment of dream-logic. There are the dark and sodden gardens, the deserted streets; and into this scene of desolation comes Stavrogin, as if driven to his victims by his guilty conscience, just as Raskol'nikov is driven to the house of the old money-lender. Although neither Šatov nor Kirillov has any logical reason to expect Stavrogin, they both know subconsciously that he will come, and show no surprise at his appearance. The sequence of scenes and their hidden symbolism, again, strongly resemble a dream. Stavrogin's conversations with both Šatov and Kirillov reveal his perilous influence upon them. The reader is here introduced to Kirillov's fanatical idea of "Man-become-God," which urges him to mount the empty throne of God through self-destruction. The scene with Šatov shows that his life is also endangered by his former absolute belief in the greatness of Stavrogin's political and social ideas. Leaving Šatov, Stavrogin makes his way through the night to his wife's house. This scene seems to embody the evil in Stavrogin's soul. It is a dark night, with the roaring wind tossing the bare tree-tops. His feet slip in the mud and before him lies "a wide, misty, empty, as it were, expanse," as if all life around him had become suddenly extinct. There is not a soul to be seen, until suddenly from the horror-instilling darkness there appears a man beside him. His shaggy hair is partly covered by a cloth cap with a brim half torn; his large eyes with their yellowish tinge have a hard glitter; and his whole appearance intensifies the impression of this dark portentous night. This stranger, the convict Fedka, offers to kill Stavrogin's wife, an offer which gives concrete expression

to Stavrogin's covert desire to free himself from his crippled wife and marry Liza.

The scene which follows with Marja Timofeevna, Stavrogin's insane wife, resembles a delirious dream. With a look of horror, she lifts her trembling hands as if in defense, as she becomes conscious of Stavrogin's fixed and searching gaze, the expression of "a malignant enjoyment of her fright" in his eyes. Then, wishing to deceive her, he suddenly changes his grim facial expression into "the most cordial and amiable smile." Like Kirillov and Šatov, she temporarily succumbs to his deceptive charm, but now she keeps careful watch for any evil which may lurk beneath the amiable smile and caressing words. For a brief moment this scene seems to become Stavrogin's dream, giving him warning of his evil subconscious, the same warning sounded by Svidrigajlov's appearance before Raskol'nikov. As though gifted with clairvoyance, Marja Timofeevna obstinately addresses Stavrogin as "Prince," distinguishing him from another, true Stavrogin. "Is he alive?" she asks him, "Have you killed him? Confess!" Perceiving the true nature of Stavrogin, she refuses to see in him her beloved, her Prince, her "noble falcon." She reveals the dream which she had before Stavrogin entered the room, and considers it a dream no longer. "When you came in just now you took out your knife," she accuses him. With Marja Timofeevna's sudden exposure of his evil ego, Stavrogin sees before him his lost goodness and his present wicked and dissolute life. In panic he flees from her.

Dostoevskij employs the technique of dream-logic also in his last novel, The Brothers Karamazov. We can find it, for example, in the scene of Ivan's first conversation with Smerdjakov, when the two see through one another so well that they unmistakably read the thoughts and feelings of each other. The efforts of Ivan's suppressed ideas to struggle out of the obscurity of his unconscious mind, and the inability of his conscious mind to make contact with these intruding elements are given in great detail. Unable to bear the restless efforts of the unconscious to unburden itself, Ivan falls ill and encounters in a hallucination, produced by his split personality, his evil ego — his devil — who effectively dramatizes Ivan's duality.

Like his predecessor, E. T. A. Hoffmann, whose main interest, according to the studies made by C. G. Jung, was

the problem of duality in human nature,¹¹ Dostoevskij in his novels avails himself of the technique of dream-logic as a mode of exploring chaotic conflicts in man. Using Freudian terms, we can describe these conflicts as the struggle between man's ego and super-ego, his "subliminal self,"¹² a theme which began to interest Dostoevskij already in the early phase of his literary career.

In Bobok, too, Dostoevskij is less concerned with the depiction of the depths of man's nature and the unconscious motives for his actions. Here he also concentrates on the philosophical issues: mankind cannot live without Christ, without a lofty moral ideal. As in Crime and Punishment, the line of demarcation between reality and dream is obliterated: it is difficult to determine whether the hero hears the muffled voices of the dead in a dream or in a waking state. Dostoevskij says explicitly that it happens in reality: "At first, I paid no attention, assuming a contemptuous attitude. Still, the conversation continued. I hear — the sounds are dull, as if the mouths are covered up with pillows; and at that — they are audible and seem quite close. I woke up and began listening intently." This picture of one of the most horrifying mystical experiences — the spiritual disintegration and moral corruption of the godless world — is given against the background of vividly realistic details: green water in the grave, every minute bailed out by the grave-digger with a scoop; a little restaurant, crowded by those attending the funeral; a half-eaten sandwich on a slab; and an elongated stone in the shape of a marble sepulcher.

Inherent in Dostoevskij's artistic method is this use of the technique of dream-logic by which he heightens the effect of the main themes and reveals hidden truths within the human soul. The author focuses his attention on the innermost recesses of man's subconscious and by means of his dream-logic technique shows the inner reality of man, and the fundamental incongruity between objective reality and man's subjective experience. For Dostoevskij, the confusion of these two realms accounts for the tormenting split in the souls of his heroes. To portray it, he skilfully employs a special style in which hallucination and reality constitute an organic unity, and in which all the causal and temporal relationships of the world of objective reality are obliterated. The author uses the technique of dream-logic also to develop

important metaphysical and moral observations for which ordinary language is inadequate.

The use of the dream-logic technique in the works of Dostoevskij underwent a series of changes. He began to use it in The Double, where the struggle of the protagonist against unbearable everyday reality is described in great detail. A confusion between objective reality and imagination weighs heavily on the deranged mind of Goljadkin, and his real being is transformed into a double who ultimately triumphs over him. In following works, Dostoevskij considerably narrowed his use of the dream-logic technique; yet he employed it when he wanted to expose the clash between objective reality and man's subjective experience. Thus, although the framework of Crime and Punishment remains realistic throughout, we find passages in which Dostoevskij availed himself of the device of dream-logic. His artistic method underwent still another change in The Idiot, in which the technique of dream-logic is used mainly to show the dream-like relationships between the characters. They — like Ivan Karamazov and Smerdjakov in The Brothers Karamazov — read each other's minds and hearts with unflinching accuracy. The technique of dream-logic in The Idiot has the effect of a shroud thrown over the realistic painting. There are, however, exceptions such as those few scenes — for example, Rogožin's appearance before Ippolit — in which dream merges with reality, or in which a human being, unable to cope with the enveloping physical world, escapes into the world of imagination, as does General Ivolgin. A further change in the dream-logic technique can be observed in The Eternal Husband. Real events are presented as the dramatized visions created by the morbid imagination of Velčaninov, who is suffering from the pangs of a guilty conscience. In The Possessed as well as in Bobok, we see still another use of the technique of dream-logic. In these two works, Dostoevskij is interested in philosophical speculations rather than in exploring man's subconscious. The powerful "urge for destruction" in The Possessed and the moral disintegration and spiritual decay of mankind living without Christ in Bobok, are conveyed by means of Dostoevskij's forceful dream-logic technique, which again effaces the line of demarcation between reality and dream.

It is this technique which imparts to Dostoevskij's works their uncanny force and their persuasive power. It is this

technique which so perfectly suits the author's artistic aim — to explain the unconscious, to disentangle and analyze the elements of man's spiritual life, and to expose remote metaphysical depths.

Notes

1. F. M. Dostoevskij, Dnevnik pisatelja za 1877 god (Paris: YMCA-Press, n.d.), p. 171.
2. Ibid., p. 171.
3. D. Čyževskij, "Zum Doppelgängerproblem bei Dostoevskij," in Dostoevskij Studien (Reichenberg: Gebrüder Stiepel, 1931), pp. 20-21.
4. PLMA, LXXIII (March 1958), 101-109.
5. Ibid., p. 103.
6. J. C. Powys, Dostoevsky (London: John Lane, 1946), p. 36.
7. See F. M. Dostoevskij's letters to his brother, Mixail, dated February 1, 1846, and April 1, 1846.
8. A. Bem, Dostoevskij: Psichanalitičeskie ètjudy (Berlin: Speer and Schmidt, 1938), p. 69.
9. It seems that the novelist uses dreams for developing thoughts for which, as he himself maintains in The Diary of a Writer and in some of his novels, ordinary language is inadequate. In A Raw Youth he interpolates an admission to this effect in Arkadij Dolgorukij's speech: "There remains unsaid in an individual infinitely more than can be adequately put in word." Arkadij is troubled not only by his inability to express satisfactorily his thoughts and more particularly his feelings, but also by his fear that, in the formulation, these ideas may lose something of their depth and value. "Our thoughts," he reflects, "even the least significant ones, are deeper so long as they remain within us. Once expressed, the same thoughts appear to us ridiculous and, as it were, dishonorable . . ." (cf. Tjutčev's famous line from "Silentium": "Mysl' izrečennaya est lož'" — "The thought expressed is a lie.") Similar statements and observations appear in many works of Dostoevskij. His characters often suffer because their experiences appear distorted when put into words, and consequently they are not taken seriously by their fellow men, as in the case of Ippolit or Prince Myškin. As may be seen from Netočka Nezvanova, Dostoevskij attaches great significance to dreams, since he considers that they reveal not only the true nature of man, but also the predestined way of his spiritual growth. "There are moments," Dostoevskij says here, "in which all intellectual and spiritual strength is morbidly strained to a point where it suddenly flares up in a blazing flame of knowledge. At such an instant, the disturbed soul, tormented by presentiments of the future, has a prophetic

dream. We then long to live; our entire being craves for it; and the heart becomes filled with a flaming, even if blind, hope, challenging, as it were, the unknown future with all its mystery, even if it should be full of violent storms and hurricanes, so long as it is also full of life." For Dostoevskij, the seeming absurdities of dreams, visions, presentiments, hallucinations, and other revelations of the irrational mind, hint at mysteries of cosmic proportions, which would be unveiled to man if he were but able to understand the symbolism of the message. Informed by his dreams, in which his restless unconscious announces its contents, the hero of Dostoevskij often perceives what is hidden within him. In this way he can see that the irrational aspects of his nature communicate directly with external forces which the rational mind cannot comprehend. The interpretation of dreams brings Dostoevskij back to E. T. A. Hoffmann, who claimed that what is customarily called dream and fantasy is really the symbolical manifestation of the hidden thread running through man's life, and connecting it in all its parts. Maintaining that man's unconscious is accessible only in dreams and hallucinations, Hoffmann said: "... in dream a strange voice informs us of things we did not know, or about which we were at least in doubt, regardless of the fact that the voice which seems to bring us strange knowledge really comes only from our own innermost being and speaks aloud in intelligible words." (E. T. A. Hoffmann, Werke, ed. W. Harich [Weimar, 1924], I, 181.)

10. Some scholars have already treated this subject to a certain extent. See A. Bem, op. cit., and R. Tymms, Doubles in Literary Psychology (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1949).

11. C. G. Jung, Gestaltungen des Unbewussten (Zürich: Rascher, 1950).

12. Siegmund Freud, Abriss der Psychoanalyse: Das Unbehagen in der Kultur (Frankfurt am Main, Hamburg: Fischer, 1950), p. 8.

SCIENTIFIC LINGUISTICS AND RUSSIAN GRAMMARS

By Morton Benson

University of Pennsylvania

In recent decades American scientific linguists have exerted strong influence on FL teaching and textbooks.¹ These linguists, often called structuralists or descriptivists, have, generally, a common approach to FL teaching. From this structuralist approach various criteria have evolved for the evaluation of FL textbooks. These linguistic standards have been assembled and discussed very ably by Professor Archibald Hill in a study entitled Language Analysis and Language Teaching.² Other discussions of FL textbooks by structuralists are, of course, available. An example is Professor Robert A. Hall's popularizing book Leave Your Language Alone.³

Some of the standards advocated by descriptivists are not new and coincide with those put forth by traditionalists. For example, everyone obviously wants clear explanations of grammar. Other linguistic criteria, however, are not acceptable to many traditionalists. In fact, the existing controversy between the structuralists and traditionalists has created a split, which often makes any rapport between the two groups impossible. Certainly it would be desirable to stimulate an exchange of views and objective investigation of both approaches.

The purpose of this paper is to clarify the role that scientific linguistics can play in improving beginning Russian grammars. To accomplish this purpose, the following procedure will be used. First of all, four recently published Russian grammars will be evaluated according to linguistic standards. The discussion will then go on to present briefly the arguments made by traditionalists against structural linguistics. Finally, a general conclusion will be drawn.

The four grammars of Russian which will be discussed are: 1. Eva Friedl. Introduction to Russian: A First Year Course. Coral Gables, Florida: Author, 1959. vi, 166 pp.

(mimeographed). Available through University of Miami Bookstore. 2. Thais S. Lindstrom. Manual of Beginning Russian. New York: American Book Company, 1959. viii, 152 pp., \$3.75. 3. Horace G. Lunt. Fundamentals of Russian (First Russian Course). New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1958. xi, 320 pp. 4. Anna H. Semeonoff. A New Russian Grammar. 12th (revised) ed. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1958. xvii, 323 pp. \$3.75. These will be referred to by the names of the authors.

The first requirement made by linguists is that a textbook treat the FL as an oral system of communication. Writing is only a secondary representation of this oral system. The emphasis placed by linguists on the spoken aspect of language leads to their insistence on an accurate, detailed phonetic introduction in any beginners' grammar. The only one of the four textbooks to meet this requirement is Lunt (which is structuralist in its approach). This book describes the sounds of Russian on the basis of a very reasonable compromise between the phonetic and phonemic approaches. The phonetically quite distinct allophones [ɛ], [ʏ], and [ə] of the phonemes /e/, /i/, and /a/ respectively, are treated as independent sounds in the transcription. This practical compromise is important. It facilitates the acquisition of a good pronunciation without introducing a mass of phonetic detail. Professor Lunt's book describes clearly the complicated relationship of the sound system to the writing system. The articulation of the individual Russian sounds is treated briefly, but accurately. Adequate provision is made for practicing the pronunciation of typical Russian words. All in all, this phonetic introduction is an excellent demonstration of how scientific linguistics can be applied to pedagogical needs, although some traditionalist instructors may find the style quite formidable.

An example of a far too short, completely inadequate, often inaccurate phonetic introduction is seen in Lindstrom. Only three pages are devoted to the alphabet, handwriting, capitalization rules, punctuation rules, pronunciation of Russian, and practice in pronouncing cognates. The whole problem of consonant softening is disposed of in two short, inaccurate statements. These are: 1. "Consonants are always palatalized, that is, pronounced with a very slight 's' sound [sic] if they are followed by the softener '́'" (p. 3). 2. "Note that the soft vowels are formed by the addition of the y- glide

at the beginning of the hard sound " (p. 2). The latter statement obscures the fact that in Russian it is the consonants that are softened, not the vowels. Certain vowel symbols simply indicate the softening of preceding consonants. In the texts of Friedl and Semeonoff, there is confusion between sound and spelling. In Semeonoff we read the following (p. 14): "Certain consonants, the gutturals, g, k, x and the sibilants ž, č, š, šč, cannot be followed by the vowels ja, ju, y, which are accordingly replaced by a, u, i . . ." Such a statement is most misleading. For example, after ž and š, the sound represented by y is always pronounced, rather than i, even though the symbol i is written. Similarly, after č and šč, the sounds ja and ju are pronounced even though the spelling requires a and u. The same jumble of spelling and sound is continued in the following statement (ibid.): "After c, ja and ju are replaced by a and u, but y remains, since euphony does not demand any alternation, e.g., cyfra [sic], ovcy." This statement bumbles phonetic facts. The introduction of "euphony" as a phonetic factor is completely unjustified.

A good linguistic description would include information on the pronunciation of Russian vowels in stressed and non-stressed positions. Semeonoff, however, repulses any attempt to describe those changes which take place in unstressed vowels. She writes as follows (p. 11): "Although Russian vowels, when unstressed, lose their full value, it is very wrong to assign to them any other definite value. It is very wrong to say that the first o in kotoryj is like 'a' or that voda is pronounced 'vada.'" This declaration is in absolute contradiction to all existing phonetic and phonemic analyses of Russian, both Western and Soviet.

An example of an impressionistic, subjective, vague phonetic description is offered in Friedl (p. 9): "One outstanding principle is that Russian vowels are pronounced more clearly than English vowels."

Linguists generally recommend that a phonemic transcription be used along with the traditional orthography throughout a book. Of the books being discussed, Lunt is the only one which does supply a phonemic transcription, and even this is discontinued after the fourth lesson. Some structuralists would be against any use of the Russian alphabet whatsoever, until the students have mastered the Russian sound system. The use of a transcription, either as a companion to the regular orthography, or as the only writing

system, meets with considerable opposition from traditionalists. Semeonoff, for example, brands any transcription for Russian superfluous when she writes naïvely (p. 14): "... one has every help in the perfect system of the alphabet, in which there is one sign for every sound . . . "

In view of the claimed primacy of the spoken language, linguists generally oppose the reading of literature in beginning texts and stress, instead, work on conversational material. Three of the books under discussion — Friedl, Lindstrom, and Lunt — adhere mostly to the use of colloquial Russian. Friedl and Lindstrom, in particular, provide lively, brisk everyday conversation. Lunt goes into some detail on a feature of vernacular Russian, normally not treated in traditional grammars, namely, the contraction of patronymics such as Ivanyč in place of Ivanovič, Ivanna in place of Ivanovna, etc. (pp. 77-78). Such information is highly desirable in a description of spoken Russian. Lunt omits, however, mention of another contraction which in normal speech is just as important as that of patronymics — the contraction of numerals: desjat' = /d'es't'/, odinnadcat' = /ad'incat'/, etc.

Semeonoff, in contrast to the other three texts, draws heavily from classical authors (Krylov, Puškin, Gogol', Dostoevskij, Tjutčev, L. Tolstoj, etc.). Not only prose, but even poetry is cited. Structural linguists would bitterly challenge the suitability of Krylov's fables or Puškin's lyrics for acquainting beginners with the basic grammatical structure of Russian.

Descriptive linguists hold that a modern language should be described strictly as it is spoken at present. Traditional grammars have often confused the description of a contemporary language by introducing historical data. In Semeonoff, for example, we see misuse of the diachronic approach. She states that the soft and hard signs (along with j) are semi-vowels! (p. 9.) From the point of view of modern Russian this is absurd. The soft and hard signs in the contemporary language do not represent vowels at all, but usually serve to show the presence of palatalization or of a following [j]. This blunder evidently results from confusion with the pronunciation of the jers in Old Russian as reduced vowels. It is also an abuse of the diachronic approach to list, even in parentheses, the hard sign as one of the "endings" for the masculine noun declension (p. 30). It is ironical that Semeonoff misses a fine opportunity to give a stimulating historical

sidelight on the role of Old Bulgarian forms in Russian. Instead of pointing out the historical, stylistic, and semantic aspects of such doublets as glava — golova, kratkiĭ — korotkiĭ, etc., she simply states that -ra-, -re-, and -la- "change into" -oro-, -ere-, and -olo- (p. 16). She hereby incorporates borrowed forms into a supposedly Russian phonetic alternation.

Linguists require that a textbook provide clear, accurate grammatical analyses, based as much as possible on form rather than meaning. The worst offender in regard to old-fashioned grammatical definitions based solely on meaning is Friedl. The following definitions quoted therefrom are typical: "A Noun is the name of a person, place, thing, or general idea" (p. 13); "An Adjective is a word which describes, qualifies, or modifies a Noun" (p. 16); "A Verb is a word which stands for an action, a state, or a condition" (ibid.).

In regard to clarity in grammatical explanations all textbooks under discussion occasionally err. Here is a jarring example from Friedl: "It [Russian] has six cases . . . which show the reflection denoted by the given noun and that by the other words of the sentence" (p. 55). Here is an example of concise linguistic abstruseness from Lunt in the original punctuation (p. 234): "Gerunds in -ja or -(v)ši not those in -v! may have the particle -s! never -sja! . . ." To be sure, most of Lunt's explanations are worded clearly and are superior to those found in the other books under discussion. His new approach to verb conjugation will be mentioned below.

Semeonoff introduces confusing jargon when she uses the term imperfect and perfect in addition to imperfective and perfective in discussing verbal aspect (p. 27). Lindstrom also brings in an unnecessary term when she talks of a semi-perfective aspect (p. 82).

In addition to unclear wording and confusing terminology, outright errors also occur in grammatical explanations. Semeonoff makes several statements which are not correct. For example, ob'ezžat' 'to break in' (a horse) is described as having no perfective (p. 226). Actually, it does have a perfective form— ob'ezdit'. Or, that bol'šoj and malen'kiĭ are supposedly replaced in the predicate function by velik and mal (p. 249). The fact is that both bol'šoj and malen'kiĭ can definitely be used as predicate adjectives: dom bol'šoj 'the house is large'; deti eščë malen'kie 'the children are still small.' Even Lunt's book contains a few slips. For

example, it states that "the genitive case must be used for the direct object of negated verbs" (p. 51). This is erroneous. Both the Academy *Grammatika* and recent research articles point out clearly that in some instances the accusative is not only permissible but preferable.⁴

We now turn to an extremely important part of Russian textbooks, the exercises. Linguists maintain that good exercises are those which supply material for varied pattern drills. A good exercise concentrates on a single problem and helps the student master a construction by forcing him to repeat over and over. The traditional exercise of translating long sentences into the language being learned is condemned by linguists. Professor Hill writes as follows: "A bad book presents a set of sentences to be laboriously translated, employing many different constructions in any of which the student can make a mistake."⁵ None of the four books provides enough material for pattern drilling. Probably the best text in regard to drill material is Lindstrom. This book contains a variety of exercises, many of which call for short answers. Translation is often used, but the sentences are moderate in length, and concentrated on one problem. Here is a typical exercise from Lindstrom utilizing translation (p. 41). A model question and answer are given first in Russian: o čëm vy sprašivaete? o zavtrake. With this model in mind, the student has to render into Russian similar sentences such as: "What is he talking about? — About the rug. What is she speaking about? — About the easy lesson." This type of drill seems superior to the lengthy sentences for translation which dominate in Lunt. Indeed, for many, the exercises will be the most disappointing feature of this book. Occasionally Lunt requires the translation of stilted, awkward sentences. For example (p. 124): "She lives with her jolly children, her old mother, and her handsome husband in the old building between the old bank and the new movie."

In closing the critical review of these four textbooks, the following should be noted: although various shortcomings have been pointed out in these books,⁶ each one contains good material and in the hands of capable teachers could be effectively used.

We can now turn to several critical remarks regarding the place of structural linguistics in the preparation of FL textbooks. Although this paper has evaluated Russian textbooks according to selected criteria, championed by

structuralists, it does not signify any claim that the latter have a monopoly on the ability to prepare good FL textbooks. There are in use today many excellent, successful FL texts written by traditionalists. Nor does this paper imply blanket approval of the structuralist theories regarding FL teaching and description. Every FL teacher and linguist should read the brilliant criticism of structuralism published by Gordon Messing.⁷ Professor Messing makes the telling point that descriptive linguistics has largely ignored the tremendous impact of the written word, of literature on language. He points out that it is absurd to prepare a grammar for a language with a long literary tradition in the same manner as for a language which has no alphabet. In preparing the grammar of a language never before described, it is obviously possible and desirable to make the description original. On the other hand, in dealing with the structure of a language like French or Russian, originality in description (especially of morphology and syntax) may lie in form only, with no substance.

Traditionalist doubts as to the worth of a phonemic transcription in beginners' grammars have been cited above. In fact, both structuralist and traditionalist have been arbitrary in advocating or condemning transcription. Neither side has any proof of the correctness of its position. Probably the educational psychologist could be of aid to FL teachers and linguists in evaluating objectively the use of a transcription.

Many FL teachers do not accept the requirement that a grammar be strictly synchronic. They feel that some historical data should be introduced to provide interesting background information. For example, historical facts can be helpful to students when they take up noun case usage with the Russian numerals or doublets such as *glava* — *golova*. These facts need in no way obscure the description of modern Russian.

In spite of the reservations just mentioned, the general conclusion of this paper is that structural linguistics can make an important contribution to improving Russian textbooks. Most of the criteria presented above appear desirable, and if judiciously applied, would have helped to eliminate many of the worst defects noted in these textbooks. Also, originality in description may be much more than form. Lunt's original treatment of Russian verb conjugation (pp. 41-42) is an example of a new, fresh approach, which

presents the linguistic facts more accurately than heretofore. (Lunt's description works back from the 3rd person plural.) Future grammars of Russian can be superior to existing ones if textbook writers utilize critically the principles of structuralism.

Notes

1. A shorter version of this paper was read at the April 1960 meeting of the Indiana AATSEEL Chapter in Indianapolis.
2. MLA. FL Bulletin, No. 41 (December 1955).
3. (Ithaca, 1950).
4. See Academy Grammatika II, part 1 (1954), p. 123; Z. Uglitsky, "Accusative and Genitive with Transitive Verbs Preceded by a Negative in Contemporary Russian," The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXIV (1956), 377-387; T. F. Magner, "Negation and Case Selection in Russian," Slavic Word, IV (1955), 531-541.
5. Op. cit., p. 9.
6. Only those defects pertinent to the discussion have been pointed out. Numerous minor errors were also noted in these books. One exasperating feature of Friedl's book was the inclusion of material taken from other sources with no credit given. For example, page 11 A, containing a drill table on hard and soft consonants, was taken intact from this writer's article "An Introduction to Russian Pronunciation," Modern Language Journal XLI (Feb. 1957), 79.
7. "Structuralism and Literary Tradition," Language, XXVII (1951), 1-17.

WHAT SHOULD A RUSSIAN MAJOR KNOW?

By Nathan Rosen

Bowdoin College

The problems involved in teaching the Russian language have come so much to the fore lately that other essential problems tend to be ignored. It is well to keep in mind that Slavic studies merely begin with the teaching of Russian — they do not end with it. In time the college teacher will be asked to give courses in Russian and Soviet literature and he will also be expected now and then to toss off something original and interesting on the subject. Just how well prepared is he as a teacher and scholar?

It is generally assumed that the best preparation is an undergraduate major in the Russian Department, followed by graduate work leading to the Ph. D. degree. The undergraduate major program has two traditional objectives: to develop competence in the Russian language and to provide a knowledge of Russian literature. Specific minors in other fields are rarely prescribed, although it is commonly suggested that undergraduates take up French or German in anticipation of the Ph. D. reading examinations. The emphasis is quite clearly on competence in language and literature, and no one would dispute that this is the proper and legitimate concern of a foreign language department — of any foreign language department: French, German, Classics, or Russian. The Russian Department then has the same aims as any other foreign language department, and it assumes that it should use the same means of achieving those aims, namely, by asking the student to take a prescribed number of courses within the department. This constitutes the "Russian major program."

Yet a glance at the course offerings in most colleges will dispel the notion that the Russian department is similar to other language departments. The French or German major will take a sequence of electives that will provide a survey of the whole literary history in his field. He will have a firm sense of continuity and development. The

Russian major, however, will rarely find any sequence of courses that would give him a sense of continuity. His basic course will not be a "Survey of Russian Literature from the Primary Chronicle to 1917." Instead, he will be asked to concentrate his attention upon the nineteenth century in such courses as "Russian Classics from Puškin to 1917" or "The Russian Novel in the Nineteenth Century" or "Russian Thought in the Nineteenth Century." There may also be a course in Soviet literature, but this is secondary.

Two assumptions are implicit in this emphasis: (1) that the literature of nineteenth-century Russia towers far above the literature of preceding periods; and (2) there is no integral relationship, no continuous development, between the earlier and later literatures.

With some qualifications, these two assumptions are correct. The earlier literature was either religious, popular, or a mechanical imitation of Western literature. It was only in the nineteenth century that Russian literature — like the ghost of Akakij Akakievič — loomed suddenly out of the darkness to force the dazed world to pay tribute to its power.

Many explanations could be advanced for the brilliance of nineteenth-century Russian literature. There was the supply of genius, the development of the literary language, the rapport between the writer and his audience, the intellectual climate, and particularly the need to define Russia's identity vis-à-vis the West. The Russian awareness of Europe — of its thought, its literature, its revolutionary history — was obsessive. As Dostoevskij said in The Diary of a Writer, "We Russians have two homelands: our Russia and Europe." And he claimed that the Russians had, to an unsurpassed degree, the ability to assimilate the best of Western culture and to improve upon it. Recent Soviet triumphs in science seem like a re-enactment of the nineteenth-century achievement. It is not necessary to go into the details of that achievement — the story has been traced by Hauman, Simmons, Veselovskij, Miliukov, and others. The conclusion is inescapable that one cannot understand the literature and intellectual life of nineteenth-century Russia without some knowledge of what Puškin, Tolstoj, and Dostoevskij knew, of what stimulated, inspired, and vexed them: I mean Western thought, Western literature, Western history.

It would therefore seem obvious that a necessary prerequisite for graduate work in the Slavic field is a knowledge

of the intellectual, literary, and historical currents in Western Europe — particularly in England, France, and Germany — in the periods when Europe most deeply influenced Russia. Such knowledge is not to be gained in graduate school, where courses become ever more specialized. The proper place to obtain this knowledge is in college. Yet is there any college that provides such knowledge for its Russian majors?

The Russian undergraduate major should not only know more than Russian literature but he should also know more than the Russian language. It is a peculiar circumstance of Russian literary history that criticism by Russians has for the most part been social rather than literary. And this has been true in both tsarist and Soviet Russia. It became the responsibility of western Slavists, particularly in France and Germany, to correct this imbalance. Hence many of the major critical works are available only in French or German. Even now the greatest of western Slavists — located at Heidelberg, Aarhus, Harvard, and Paris — write chiefly in French and German. It would therefore seem logical to expect young Slavic scholars in America to acquire a fluent reading knowledge of French and German. Such fluency is unfortunately not required at present. The language tests set up for Ph. D. candidates are unsatisfactory. To stiffen the tests is not the answer: students would simply "bone up" more intensively for the test — and quickly forget afterward what they had so quickly learned. A foreign language can be mastered only by intensive and systematic reading over a period of years.

The two objectives set forth here — familiarity with West European literary and intellectual currents and a fluent knowledge of French and German — can be met quite simply by replacing the traditional Russian major program by an entirely new concept. Before we discuss it, however, it will be convenient to summarize our findings in the form of five specific objectives for the undergraduate major in Russian:

1. A good reading knowledge and fair speaking knowledge of Russian. This can be acquired in the usual three-year sequence of Russian language courses.¹

2. A knowledge of the main facts of Russian literature. This could be given as one full survey course of two semesters. In colleges lacking a survey course, conference hours could be substituted,

with lectures replaced by a standard textbook such as Mirsky's History of Russian Literature or Slonim's Epic of Russian Literature.

3. A fluent reading knowledge of French and German.

4. A knowledge of the main facts in French, German, and English literature in the periods when they most influenced Russian culture, i. e., the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This knowledge can be acquired by suitable courses in all three language departments.

5. A knowledge of the main facts of modern European intellectual and political history. This could be gained in the usual first-year course in the History of Western Civilization, strengthened by courses in nineteenth-century history and (where possible) by a course in Russian history.

What is proposed, in effect, is that the traditional two-year concentration of courses in the Russian Department be replaced by an interdepartmental major consisting of five substantial minors — Russian, English, French, German, and History — with administrative control vested in the Russian Department.²

At first glance such a program may seem too sweeping and ambitious, going beyond the possibilities of a two-year major program. Nevertheless, it is quite practicable, once we give up the idea that a Russian major must have a thorough knowledge of Russian literature. Such a knowledge is really unnecessary, since the student will get it in any case in graduate school. One ordinary survey course in college would be perfectly adequate. The remaining time would be devoted to the Russian language and the four minors.

An interdepartmental "Russian major" program along these lines was recently approved at Bowdoin College. The major program consists of the following courses:

1. Courses in the Russian Department:
 - (a) Three-year sequence in the Russian language
 - (b) Survey of Russian literature (given as conference hours)
2. Courses in the French Department:
 - (a) Classical French literature
 - (b) French literature of the Enlightenment
 - (c) French literature of the nineteenth century

3. Courses in the German Department:
 - (a) Survey of German literature
 - (b) The Romantic Movement in Germany
 - (c) Goethe
4. Courses in the History Department:
 - (a) History of Western civilization
 - (b) Political thought from the sixteenth century
 - (c) Russia and East Central Europe
5. Courses in the English Department:
 - (a) History of the English novel in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries
 - (b) Nineteenth century prose and poetry
 - (c) Shakespeare (two semesters)

COMMENTS

1. The program assumes that the student will have entered college with some knowledge of French or German. It is also assumed that in his last two years of college he will take five courses each semester.

2. All the courses listed, except Shakespeare, cover approximately the same time span. The student has the advantage of covering the major literary movements of Neoclassicism and Romanticism as they are reflected in the literatures of three countries.

3. The new Russian major required no new courses. The program takes advantage of existing courses in all departments. The program is therefore quite practical from a financial viewpoint.

4. Each college would have to set up its own program in accordance with the courses available. Once the program has been set up, however, few deviations should be permitted. The value of this program lies precisely in the range of courses, carefully chosen to be of maximum value for the Russian major. Certain deviations are foreseeable — for example, someone might be interested in German idealistic philosophy and would like to study its influence on Russian thought. Such deviations should not become excessive.

5. The courses in the English Department require some comment. Shakespeare is included because he played an important role in Russian literature (Puškin, Turgenev, Tolstoj); because an intensive study of one truly major figure has its own special merits; and because of a liberal education without Shakespeare is unthinkable.

Courses in the English Department have a particular value apart from content. The English Department has been especially concerned with upholding the standards of good writing. A student who takes courses in this department will learn to write papers that are well organized and well expressed. This is no small accomplishment nowadays. A second consideration is this: the English Department is the only language and literature department which can count upon the student's full and instant understanding of the language used. In this respect it is quite unlike foreign language departments. The English Department can therefore make a close study of literary texts as literature with special profit. In addition, this department has tended to be most aware of developments in modern literary criticism. The Russian major who takes courses in the English Department will gain insights and critical approaches which he can advantageously apply to Slavic works. It should be remembered that the Russian Formalist movement did not last long enough to produce a fully matured criticism applicable to all the major Russian writers. Hence students should take full advantage of the rich mature criticism that has become such a distinctive feature of the American scene.

Finally, there are special advantages in the interdepartmental major. It is highly significant that the program was inspired by the needs of Bowdoin College — a small representative New England institution with 800 students and some 60 teachers. Although small, it has been quite progressive. In 1941, immediately after Pearl Harbor, Bowdoin College set up a two-year Russian program. At present a three-year program is going into effect. Like many small colleges, Bowdoin would like to have a full-scale major program but cannot afford it; indeed, as yet it cannot even have a survey course in Russian literature. The interdepartmental program in Russian was approved almost unanimously as a logical solution to the problem. The program requires no additional courses; it takes maximum advantage of the excellent courses and teaching staff in other departments; it makes a Russian major program possible even when there is only one Russian instructor; and the student specializing in Russian under this program will emerge as fully qualified as any graduate of a major university. And in view of his broad preparation, he may well be better qualified! Thus students can enjoy the benefits of a small college and yet major in Russian.

If good colleges of modest size adopted this plan, it would relieve the strain on the few large Slavic centers. The latter could then concentrate their faculty and resources on graduate students and research work.

Let us now see how the Bowdoin College major program would affect the student after he graduates. In choosing a thesis topic in graduate school he will be able, thanks to his knowledge of European languages and literatures, to work both in the Russian field and in comparative literature; he is also free to study the relations between literature and European intellectual history. Thus his range of topics for research has widened considerably. This broad range of interest will also be reflected in his postdoctoral work. As a teacher he will prove stimulating because he will be able to relate his students' knowledge of West European literature and history to Russian developments. He will also be able to analyze literature incisively from every aspect, and he will be able to provide a more accurate account of Russian literature.

From many points of view then the Bowdoin plan has much to commend it. It should appeal to the small college that cannot afford to expand its offerings; it should appeal to the large Slavic centers because it will ensure graduate students who are adequately prepared; and it should appeal to the student himself because it will provide a truly liberal education even while it prepares him to become a competent scholar and teacher.

The Bowdoin plan may not be the only possible alternative to the traditional curriculum but it does offer a critique and a solution that deserve serious consideration. In this period of great flux in the Slavic field it is time that we made a searching reappraisal of what we have and where we are going and what we want from our Russian majors. If this essay on the Bowdoin plan does no more than provoke such thinking it will have served its purpose.

Notes

1. A fourth year could be provided by attending the summer session at Indiana University. This would make a useful addition.
2. Where possible, there should be collaboration between the Russian Department and the other departments. For example, if a term paper is required in French or German, the subject might well be some aspect of Russian-French or Russian-German cultural relations. Or a comprehensive major examination could be the joint product of all five departments.

REVIEWS

Dmitrij Tschizewskij. Formalistische Dichtung bei den Slaven. (Heidelberger Slavische Texte, 3.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1958. 60 pp., DM 5.80.

Dmitrij Tschizewskij. Zwei russisch-kirchenslavische Texte. (Heidelberger Slavische Texte, 4.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1958. 31 pp., DM 4.

Johannes Holthusen und Dmitrij Tschizewskij. Versdichtung der russischen Symbolisten: Ein Lesebuch. (Heidelberger Slavische Texte, 5/6.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959. 135 pp., DM 8.80.

Professor Tschizewskij and Dr. Johann Schröpfer of Heidelberg University have begun a very useful edition of Slavic texts intended for pedagogical purposes. They single out certain themes or problems from the whole field of Slavic studies and present a selection which should stimulate the student to work on his own on the basis of the original texts and short commentaries.

The first two booklets were Russische literarische Parodien und Berufung und Bestimmung des Dichters in der slavischen Dichtung. The third is Formalistische Dichtung bei den Slaven. The short introduction by Mr. Tschizewskij points out that poetical works are determined by their aesthetic form. Artistic language is the most obvious feature of a work of verbal art. Some poets have always tried to stress the form more than the content in order to "actualize" formal devices, which they felt were so important. This stress on form at times has led only to "play" but still it has remained useful as an exercise of an artisan handling his material. The stress on form mainly covers the three following aspects: (1) the sound pattern, (2) works in which the peculiar outward form conceals a special content, and (3) works in which the graphic (optic), not the acoustic, appearance is relevant. For each of these groups the editor presents a number of well-selected texts from nearly all Slavic languages and of all times. In the first group we have examples of alliteration, alphabetic poems, assonance, macaronic verses, proper names (heaped for sound effects), etc.; in the second group examples of versus cancrini, versus anacyclici and proteic poems; in the third different kinds of graphic "plays" ranging from the plain figure-poems (triangles, pyramids) to acrostics. The small volume contains a selected bibliography and will certainly fulfill its purpose, which is to introduce the student to the neglected area of poetic artisanship.

The fourth booklet in the series, Zwei russisch-kirchenslavische Texte, tackles an absolutely different problem: the

intention is to show how the same old texts become altered and are often spoiled in the process of being copied, which was practised in former times. Mr. Tschizewskij presents (1) the Slovo o milostivom Sozomene from the Sviatoslavov Izbornik 1076 and a manuscript (presumably from the circles of Old Believers) of the Heidelberg Slavisches Institut, dated from 1787, (2) the "Lion of the Monk Gerasim," a manuscript of the eleventh century (published by Sreznevskij) and a manuscript of the same collection of the Heidelberg Slavic Institute. The most striking changes and the most interesting features are pointed out in the commentary of the editor but the student has still plenty of possibilities to make comparisons and to draw his own conclusions. It is a kind of an introduction to practical text criticism and to the historical approach to language and literature and as such very useful to the beginning student.

The next double volume (edited in collaboration with Professor Johannes Holthusen) Versdichtung der russischen Symbolisten is a small anthology of Russian symbolist poetry presented in chronological order, in which the most typical poems are selected mainly from the formal and thematic point of view. Not only the chief poets of Symbolism are represented, but — in order to give an idea of the extension of the symbolist movement and of the different variations inside the symbolist "school" — numerous poems of less important poets have also been introduced. So the main stress is again pedagogical: not necessarily the best poems are selected but the most instructive ones. From this point of view the selection is a quite fortunate one. An index of the main themes (e.g., abyss and chaos, idea of God, thunderstorm, cognition, etc.) and of problems of form (e.g., colorism, unusual forms, rhymes, sonnets, etc.) facilitates for the student the finding and pursuing of certain topics. He is encouraged to continue on his own, following the paths outlined by the texts, the commentaries, and the introductory remarks to the individual poets.

I am not sure, however, whether the procedure of the editors with respect to famous poets like Brjusov or Blok and some others can be approved of. Relying on the fact that such poets are easily accessible, they give only the title of the poem and the edition where it can be found but not the text itself. This seems to contradict the idea of an anthology, which should save the reader looking for a text elsewhere, no matter how easy access to it might be. In some cases it is not quite clear why one poem is more difficult to obtain than another, e.g., Blok's "Puljubi ètu večnost' bolot" is printed in the very accessible one-volume edition of 1955 (Biblioteka poeta, Bol'saja serija) and here.

A number of misprints, apparently overlooked in proof reading should be corrected in the second edition. They are particularly dangerous in pedagogical texts.

For German students who are presumably used to such concise and relatively barren pedagogical aids, these small booklets will undoubtedly be of considerable use, but for the American student, who has become used to well-prepared, nicely formatted and beautifully edited readers, such as the fine Struve "Chekhov" reader, these booklets would tend to have more of an appalling than a useful quality.

V. Setschkareff
Harvard University

Peter Yershov, ed. Letters of Gorky and Andreev, 1899-1912.
Tr. by Lydia Weston. (Columbia Slavic Studies.) New York:
Columbia Univ. Press, 1958. vii, 200, \$4.50.

When this reviewer asked the Soviet writer Vsevolod Ivanov, this past summer, what in his opinion was Maksim Gor'kij's outstanding influence upon Russian writers, his retort was as prompt as it was laconic: "Many of us would never have been writers."

Maksim Gor'kij was so fanatically attached to Russian literature that he was forever seeking out converts to his cause. He methodically sought out young writers, carefully read their manuscripts, corrected, criticized, polemicized, made suggestions, and encouraged. This was also true of his early relationship with Leonid Andreev. Gor'kij was especially impressed with Andreev's originality, and his admiration for the younger man's talent persisted long after their mutual feelings had cooled off and bitterness had set in.

Although his senior by only two years, Gor'kij was already an international celebrity when Andreev, under the pseudonym of "James Lynch," broke into print. It was Gor'kij who "discovered" Andreev after he had read the latter's story, "Bergamot and Garaska," in the Moscow Courier, sometime in 1898. It was Gor'kij who arranged for their first meeting at the Kursk station in Moscow; it was Gor'kij who introduced Andreev to the important St. Petersburg literary magazines; took him into the intimate Znanie circle, the literary family around Gor'kij which was euphemistically known as "the constellation of Big Maksim." The relationship between these two prominent writers continued for many years despite the sharp differences in their temperaments and attitudes. We have Gor'kij's own words that he considered Andreev, in these early years, his "sole friend in literary circles." Andreev, too, felt deeply beholden to the older man. "To him I am infinitely obliged for the clarification of my world outlook as a writer . . . He was the first to speak to me of my talent . . . the first to teach me the loftiness of a writer's profession." And even as late as August 12, 1911, when political and literary differences had irrevocably divided the two men, Andreev still wrote to Gor'kij: "As before, I have no other friend besides you."

The Letters of Gorky and Andreev, 1899-1912, a correspondence consisting of 101 letters between these two prominent Russian writers, brings into focus the history of their relationship, gives us new insights into the characters of these writers as men, and illuminates the background and spirit of their times.

This correspondence was taken from the collection of documents and manuscripts in the Archives of Russian and East European History and Culture at Columbia University. The letters were bought in manuscript form from an agent of the Andreev family and with the exception of a few letters which appeared in the Soviet Union previously, are published here for the first time. The editing of the Letters, Introduction, and the Notes was done by Peter Yershov, former Dean of the Faculty of Literature of the Odessa University and Dean of the Faculty of Drama at the Odessa Conservatory. Since 1952, Professor Yershov has been a Senior Fellow of the Research Programme on the U.S.S.R. Miss Lydia Weston is responsible for the translation of the Introduction, Letters, and the Notes.

The Gor'kij-Andreev letters are a major contribution to the field of Gor'kij and Andreev research and one of the most significant publications on these writers in recent years, in any language. It is therefore all the more regrettable that the Notes are not always sufficiently explicit, that important omissions are made in the Select Bibliography, and that the wonderful prose of these fine Russian writers is rendered so inadequately into English.

The 16 letters which are included in the Letters of Gorky and Andreev, 1899-1912 and which, as mentioned by Professor Yershov in his footnote (p. 3), had already appeared in M. Gor'kij: Materialy i issledovaniya, I, 140-178, edited by V. A. Desnitskij, a Gor'kij biographer and scholar, were also published earlier by the same V. A. Desnitskij, in a volume entitled: M. Gor'kij: Očerki žizni i tvorčestva (Leningrad: GIXL, 1935), pp. 107-142. Some of these letters were published in slightly varied versions and it would have added considerably to the scholarly stature of this collection if the variations in the earlier texts, many of which had been published from copies rather than originals, had been either noted or footnoted.

In the Select Bibliography, the editor again fails to list a number of recent and important publications dealing with this period, put out by the A. M. Gor'kij Institute of World Literature. Perhaps the most significant omission among these is the correspondence between Maksim Gor'kij and his publisher, K. P. Pjatnitskij, entitled: Arxiv A. M. Gor'kogo: A. M. Gor'kij: Pis'ma k K. P. Pjatnitskomu, Vol. IV (Moskva: GIXL, 1954).

Among some of the literary gaucheries that pepper the translation are the following:

"But we must talk over all these profundities nose to nose" (p. 114).

"I feel my vital brotherhood and sonship" (p. 118).

"So that you can float out of the 'ocean' of your cold intellectualities" (p. 122).

"Interpreted hostilely for you" (p. 133).

"The house must be heated in the frost" (p. 143).

The Russian expression, "ot serdca," which means "from the bottom of one's heart" is translated as "about the heart" (p. 120).

Slavic scholarship in the United States has long passed its infancy, and it is high time that it should mature and come of age.

Filia Holtzman
Brooklyn College

A. M. van der Eng-Liedmeier. Soviet Literary Characters: An Investigation into the Portrayal of Soviet Men in Russian Prose 1917-1953. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, XXIX.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1959. 174pp., f. 16.

The interest shown in the West in Soviet literature has been on the increase of late. It may be seen not only in such a fact as the publication of the present reviewer's general survey of

Soviet literature in German translation in a revised and updated edition, but also in the appearance of a number of works dealing with different aspects of Soviet literature. Suffice it to mention here such volumes as E. J. Brown's The Proletarian Episode in Russian Literature (1953), V. Erlich's Russian Formalism (1955), R. W. Mathewson's The Positive Hero in Russian Literature (1958), E. J. Simmons's Russian Fiction and Soviet Ideology (1958), Through the Glass of Soviet Literature (1953), V. Zavalishin's Early Soviet Writers (1958), and G. Gibian's Interval of Freedom: Soviet Literature During the Thaw, 1954-1957 (1960). Dr. A. M. van der Eng-Liedmeier's book is one of the most recent additions to these literary Sovietica. It introduces a novel approach to the subject: instead of surveying a period or a movement, studying an individual writer or some specific themes, or discussing the impact of politics on literature, it offers an attempt to analyze the literary typology of Soviet works of fiction.

The first thing that strikes the reader of this book is its extraordinarily neat organization, its symmetrical composition. While it may appear as a great virtue, this very neatness is fraught, as we shall see, with some dangers. The book is divided into four chapters and a Conclusion. The division into chapters corresponds to the division of Soviet literature prior to Stalin's death (the post-Stalin period is ignored by the author) into four periods, each chapter bearing the same title except for the dates: "Literary Types in the First Period (1917-29)," and so on. The periodization proposed by Dr. Eng-Liedmeier for her own purposes is as follows: 1917-1929; 1929-1934; 1934-1941; and 1946-1953; the period of World War II is omitted because of the essential differences it presents from the point of view from which the author approaches Soviet literature; as she says, "It is impossible, we think, to call the war against Hitler a task imposed by the Party in the same way as the preceding socialist construction of the country. It is not even a specific communist enterprise as the revolution and the civil war to some extent were. The characters we find in the fiction of this period are mostly represented as national heroes or as simple Russians, but very rarely as typical Soviet men" (p. 9). While this statement in itself is somewhat debatable, it also brings out an important defect of the book, viz., the author's failure to clarify her concept of "Soviet men," although an attempt to do so is made on pp. 7-8. The above explanation does, however, throw some light on the author's main approach. For the rest, the division into four periods "is based on the fact that in each of these periods new tendencies appear, different ways of showing us Soviet men in their attempts to combine harmoniously personal propensities and social duty: old characters disappear and new types arise mostly in connection with changes in their social functions, for in each of these periods the social background varies in accordance with new tasks set by the Party" (p. 9).

The chronological division is neatly intersected within each chapter with the thematic one, so that each chapter is divided into four sections bearing identical subtitles: "No Conflict," "Love Problems," "Moral and Psychological Problems," and "Conclusion." In the short Introduction the author explains her general method and this arrangement of chapters. She divides all Soviet men shown in fiction into two kinds: the "uncomplicated"

and the "complicated" type. In the characters of the first type "there is a complete harmony or at any rate no serious conflict between personal propensities and social duty," although the author's portrayal of this type may vary — from blatant idealization to a caricature. In the characters of the second type there exists a certain tension between the social and the personal spheres of life. Having thus divided all fictional Soviet men, the author explains the arrangement of her book as follows:

Each period is treated in a separate chapter: in the first part the uncomplicated characters are brought together; in the second part the treatment of the theme of love is examined, and the third part deals with the various moral and psychological problems with which characters of the given period may be confronted. In the conclusion at the end of each chapter a survey will be given of the types of Soviet men met with in the works of the given period. A comparison of these conclusions at the end of the book will bring out the fading away of old types, the rise of new kinds of Soviet men and the development of the types that have held out throughout the four periods discussed. (p. 10.)

This scheme is faithfully implemented by the author, who, in the following chapters, discusses, under those headings, a great number of works, singling out those which seem to her to be more typical and representative (and these include many of the better-known Soviet novels and plays), but also mentioning the less important ones. The choice is not guided by purely literary criteria and critical judgments of the works discussed are avoided as irrelevant to the author's main object. The discussion of individual works is all too brief and inevitably schematic. The analysis of the patterns of characters and situations and the conclusions reached are on the whole quite sound, but there is a tendency — inherent in this super-neat arrangement — to overgeneralize and simplify. Even granted that Soviet literature is highly regulated, and that characters and situations in it tend to run to type, this almost mathematically rectilinear dissection of it must needs miss some important points. One of the examples of the author's inclination to draw hard-and-fast lines of division is her strict classification of nearly all the writers she discusses as either "communist writers" or "fellow travellers," although she herself admits in a footnote on p. 11 that "Sometimes it is difficult or even impossible to draw the dividing line . . ." In some cases the classification seems questionable, as for instance when Konstantin Trenev is described as a communist writer (p. 38).

The book has been translated from the Dutch, and the English of the translation is at times unidiomatic. One might also wish for fewer misprints though none of them are too bad. Otherwise the book, like all the volumes in this series, has a pleasing appearance.

Gleb Struve
University of California (Berkeley)

Eugene Zamiatin. *We*. Tr. Gregory Zilboorg. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1959. xxix, 218, \$1.45.

A utopian novel can be entertaining. If rich in original ideas, it may be wonderfully stimulating. But seldom, if ever, will it be great literature. The reason: Even the most ingeniously conceived utopia will be populated by abstract schemes rather than by live individuals. Thus, George Orwell's earthly, blunt, even brutal 1984, — political satire rather than utopia — has more vigor and poignancy, makes for more exciting reading than Eugene Zamiatin's truly prophetic, subtler, but much more abstract, remote novel.

The present English edition of *We*, which features an introduction by Peter Rudy and a preface by Marc Slonim, is a re-issue of the original translation by Gregory Zilboorg which, incidentally, was also the first version anywhere, since the book could not be published in Russia, the first Russian edition being an abridged "translation" from the Czech.

The English translation is accurate. Nothing of the content is lost; on the contrary, quite often the English version is clearer and more precise. However, the very precision of the translation, the translator's meticulous care not to lose or change any detail of the original meaning, lead to a rather serious loss on the stylistic side. The style of D-530's notes has to convey several specific messages: It is the style of a mathematician of genius, combining the lofty flight of imagination with austere terseness. The many asyndeta and agrammatic constructions help to convey this impression. Perhaps the translator should have retained this style, even at the expense of clarity.

It may have been better to print $\sqrt{-1}$ rather than "square root of minus one," $= 0$ rather than "equals zero," etc., and to retain all instances in which scientific or mathematical jargon is used. Furthermore, the strangely pregnant phraseology of the original, which at times resembles that of futuristic poetry, is somewhat diluted by the translation, so that the impression of remoteness — at times the reader of the Russian version feels as if he were separated from D-530 by aeons — is lost and replaced by an immediateness reminding one more of Orwell's 1984 than of Zamiatin's original.

One more feature: D-530's disinterested idealism, the good-natured naïveté of the scholar, may not come through as clearly in the translation as it does in the original.

V. Terras
University of Illinois

Astrid Baecklund. *Personal Names in Medieval Velikij Novgorod, I: Common Names*. 195 pp. (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Etudes de Philologie slave 9.) Stockholm, 1959. 195 pp.

In the book of Baecklund, the much-neglected field of Slavic and in particular of Russian onomastics gains a valuable contribution. This neglect has been most conspicuous with respect to the Christian names of the Orthodox Calendar (the so-called

kalendarnye imena), which are of special interest for the history of Russian, since they reflect the relationship of Old Church Slavonic to Old Russian variants, the ways of adaptation into Russian of various layers of loan words, and the problems of spelling conventions.

For her study of the personal names of medieval Novgorod, the author was fortunate to have at her disposal excellent editions of Novgorod charters and documents which originated at the period of Novgorod's independence as a republic (1136-1478). Among the most important editions are the Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova, published in 1949 by the Soviet Academy, which were preceded by various other editions and critical studies by such scholars as Sreznevskij, Šaxmatov, and Lixačev.

The main bulk of Baecklund's book (pp. 88-191) is a register of twenty-one most frequent masculine names and of their variants and derivatives, which are found in the main and subsidiary Novgorod sources. The lists of these forms are arranged in the order of their frequency and equipped with critical comments. The rest of the book contains an Introduction (pp. 19-42) on the scope and sources of the study, and a linguistic analysis of the names and their derivatives.

While the Christian names are at the center of the author's interest, they are preceded by some general remarks on the structure of native Slavic names, which are (traditionally) classified into dithematic and monothematic types and into derivatives from place-names. In her exposition of the Christian names, the author considers carefully their functional and formal aspects. Of special interest is her approach to the functional value of the names. In order to establish the social function of a name and of its variants, Baecklund quotes the textual references concerning the status of their bearers. The adduced evidence fails, nevertheless, to produce generalizations as to the social distribution of the onomastic variants. For it appears that hypocoristica such as Miša (p. 144) or Pavša (p. 169) were as much used by prominent Novgorodians as were the full equivalents Mikhail or Pavel; derivative forms with suffixes, such as Fedec', Fet'ko (p. 122), appear more frequently to be of a "popular" nature, but Stepanko (p. 138), Vasil'ko (p. 109) are again names of the nobility. Valuable as the various textual references to status may be, they seem insufficient as indicators of social class. A classification in terms of relative chronology of the forms (and of their dialectal distribution) would probably have revealed a much clearer picture.

As to the expressive aspect of the derivative forms, Miss Baecklund points out that "their emotional color seems to have faded in the course of time" (p. 70). This statement is too vague to be satisfactory, and it is modified by the author in the course of the discussion. Thus she hypothesizes that the suffix -ko had an emotional nuance of intimacy or popularity, but at times also a pejorative connotation. "That is why it was often used for outstanding and well-known personalities," or why it sometimes "denoted persons of the lowest strata of society." The social and emotive functions are obviously confused here by the author, for although the two fused frequently in the history of Russian, they must, at various stages of its development, have had clearly defined functions.

The lack of historical perspective and of a distinction between social and emotive functions, as well as of derivatives which became simply nicknames, weakens, therefore, the attempt at a functional analysis of the names. Certain objections may also be raised with respect to their formal analysis. First, one could question the selection of the basic variants (capitalized at the head of each entry) on the basis of purely statistical criteria. No effort has been made to reconstruct the basic spoken form according to the age of the sources. Thus we find listed side by side the names Vasilei, Grigorei, Dmitrei and Ondrěi, Matfěi, Oleksěi. The phonetic value of the variant endings -ěi, -ii, -bi and -ei is ignored, as are also the graphic problems involved in the use of ѣ (or ѧ) instead of e, in Sěmьjun/Sěmen, Stěpan, Děmitrei, Olksa, Olksandr. An attempt to interpret a grapheme as a reflection of phonetic reality is made, however, in the case of the "ending" -e instead of jer in forms like Ivane, Stepane, Fedore. But the arguments for such an interpretation do not seem compelling: there is no reason to identify South Slavic -e (stemming from *ę, as attested for example by the Slovenian hypocoristica) with Russian -e; no Russian dialects have preserved an -e; the connection of the latter with -o is speculative, and German spelling cannot be taken as proof without a thorough examination of medieval German renderings of other Slavic loans. The author's excessive adherence to spelling is, on the other hand, responsible for the lack of any attempt to reconstruct the stress of the names, without which any historical study of Russian, and in particular of its names, remains incomplete.

The analysis of some suffixes affords also alternative interpretations. Thus -a, which is listed under the suffixes, deserves to be treated as a "formant" as much as -o and the problematic -e. (Their equivalent expressive value has been pointed out by Taszycki, Belić, and others.) The suffix -jata is, then, -jat- (from *ęt) plus -a, while -ja is historically the nom. sing. form of the suffix -jat- (< *ęt). The suffix -ut(-a) comes from two sources: from *-at- or -ut-, while -š(b) and -ša are the same suffix with different endings.

Among the names under study the most interesting is perhaps Jurbi ~ Jurii. According to Baecklund's findings, the medial g in the spelling Gjurgi in Novgorod sources has been preserved longer than the initial g. Nothing is said, however, about the origin of the j or what we should make of the gi or g spellings. The extant literature on the subject (involving Church Slav spelling tradition, vulgar Greek pronunciation, N. Russian spelling and phonology) would have warranted a fuller comment on the vicissitudes of this name.

With all the above shortcomings, the book is a pioneering work, and one can only wish for the subsequent volumes to make their appearance in the nearest possible future.

Edward Stankiewicz
Indiana University

Kazimierz Bulas and Francis J. Whitfield. The Kościusko Foundation Dictionary, Vol. I: English-Polish. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1959. xii, 1037, \$10.00.

This reviewer cannot perhaps be regarded as being completely unbiased in his evaluation of a project with which he has had contact from its earliest stages when it was first brought to the attention of the Columbia University Press and later taken over by the Kościusko Foundation. However, the final product being entirely the responsibility of the two authors listed above, it seems justifiable and perhaps even easier, for one who has seen the preparatory toil from the inside, to give an account of its main features.

It is a matter of record, published in the K. F. News Letters, that I regard this dictionary an excellent work. Thus it goes without saying that the critical remarks I am going to make only indicate either areas for possible individual difference of opinion on some general problems, or minor technical details which escaped the attention of the authors; they do not change my enthusiastic opinion.

One of the more important points, often discussed in preparing dictionaries, is the order in which to render word meanings. While some lexicographers prefer the chronological order which illustrates the historical development, others insist on the principle of frequency as being the most serviceable arrangement. It seems pretty clear that in a limited dictionary such as the one under discussion, the latter arrangement is preferable, and this is the plan the authors have followed. The only problem is that in some cases the determination may appear somewhat arbitrary, while in others one has the impression that the order, perhaps originally introduced in the entry, was not completely revised in the final editing. It is especially apparent in listing verbal and nominal meanings of English entries where sometimes the order seems doubtful. My examples are picked entirely at random; although I do not mention all of them, this is not to be construed that there are many of them. My intention is only to illustrate some difficulties. Thus it sometimes seems somewhat doubtful whether in the case of entries like, e. g., claim, play, roll, saw, share, spray the nominal meaning is really so much more predominant than it is in words like fall, hit, glow, etc. More serious reservations must be made concerning such questionable priorities as bit — wędzidło (part of bridle); brief — streszczenie (summary); profess — udawać (pretend) etc. Here, especially in cases such as profess, a possibility of a misunderstanding is increased by the order of the listing. Speaking of bit, it seems that the expression two bits would have more practical value than the nowadays hypothetical bit — 12½ cents.

On the whole, the dictionary is impressively comprehensive and adequate in rendering meanings. Phraseology is also covered to an extent which surpasses all earlier dictionaries. As for the meanings, one can mention just a few instances where a slight modification would be desirable, thus the verb to panic should be rendered as wpaść w panikę (popłoch) and not as a "stative" być ogarniętym paniką; the noun carton should be rendered as pudełko rather than pudło (cf. cartons of cigarettes, of ice cream, etc.); while we find sweet bread, (not very "palatably" rendered,

incidentally), we miss the popular sweet tooth, sweet briar, sweet roll), etc. The same holds for the familiar but still very restrictive expression in bond as used in the expression bottled in bond which is something entirely different from goods in bond. (To be sure, the expression bonded whiskey is duly introduced.)

The phonetic transcription used by the authors is very useful. The only point here which I think might be questioned is the traditional concept of long vowels in English. Especially in the case of i and i: (e. g., live, leave) it might be argued that the transcription ij for the latter would perhaps be more adequate. Incidentally, the misprint in the transcription of leave (given as l:-v) is the only one I noticed in my readings; I take this as evidence of great care and competence in proof-reading on the part of the authors and the publishers, a point which contributes to the general value of the dictionary.

I wish to stress once more that these instances are no reflection on the general usefulness of the dictionary. It is an excellent work and its authors deserve credit and gratitude for this important scholarly and professional service. The foresight of the Kościuszko Foundation and the Mouton Publishing Company in undertaking this ambitious project deserves special appreciation.

Z. Folejewski
University of Wisconsin

Uriel and Beatrice Weinreich. Yiddish Language and Folklore: A Selective Bibliography for Research. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1959. 66 pp. f. 6.

The scientific study of Yiddish made its first serious steps only at the beginning of our own century, after the Černovice Conference. But Yiddish subsequently suffered the severest, the most tragic blow which could be inflicted upon a living language — the annihilation of most of its speakers. With the liquidation of Yiddish scientific centers in Eastern Europe (the last centers of Yiddish culture were dissolved in the Soviet Union towards the end of the Stalin regime), Yiddish studies have been carried on principally in the United States. The Bibliography under review is witness that scholarship in Yiddish linguistics and folklore has here, however, risen to heights to which it could only vaguely aspire before the last war. The authors emphasize this point with poignancy when they write (in the Introduction), "Of the numerous articles [on the Yiddish language], it is probably safe to say that the more recent the better." But, as is often the case with young literary languages, the field of Yiddish is still widely cultivated by well-meaning dilettantes and incurable enthusiasts who equate good intentions with scholarly competence. By separating the wheat from the chaff, this bibliography offers the bulk of significant work in Yiddish linguistics and folklore.

What gives the linguistic part of the volume (with which this review is concerned) a particular, one may say, specifically Yiddish flavor is the inclusion of problems which do not appear in non-Yiddish bibliographies of a similar scope. These are the

problems of Yiddish as a "fusion language," and as a language invariably surrounded by coteritorial languages. The first of these problems has always been at the center of Yiddish diachronic studies. It is not surprising that Chapter 6 ("Integration of Components"), although not the most impressive in length, comprises some of the most important contributions to Yiddish linguistics by such scholars as Max Weinreich, Uriel Weinreich, S. Birnbaum, N. Shtif, R. Jakobson. "Yiddish in Countries of Emigration" constitutes separate chapter (10), dealing only with questions of the most recent contact of Yiddish with such languages as Modern Hebrew, French, English, and Spanish. Unfortunately, the authors, who provide in the Introduction an extremely lucid survey of the present state of Yiddish scholarship, fail to indicate the criteria for the classification of the material. Thus it is difficult to see the reasons for setting up two chapters, if the differences are only of degree or of chronology, or to what extent these chapters relate, in turn, to chapter 9, which deals with Yiddish dialectology. A similar question may be raised with respect to chapters 13 and 7. Both add features which are novel and most welcome for any linguistic bibliography, i.e., problems of style and of function; but the two are obviously so connected that setting them apart requires at least some explanation. The latter problems acquire likewise what may be called a specifically Yiddish character, for under the "Functions of Yiddish" we find entries exploring the relation of Yiddish to "Yidishkayt" (Jewishness), the role of Yiddish as a carrier of Jewish culture, and the position of Yiddish among other languages of the Jews.

Chapter 7 ("The Standardized Language: Usage Levels and Style") deals equally with socio-linguistic problems, such as attitudes towards modern German or English influence, or towards traditionalist style. While it looms more prominently in the history of Standard Yiddish, the question of linguistic attitudes deserves to be a broader research problem also in the history of other languages. A striking gap in this chapter is, however, the omission of works devoted to the style of the masters of Yiddish literature (e.g., Mendele, Sholem Aleichem, Peretz), whose works helped shape the modern Standard language. Absent also are studies on the language of older Jewish texts, of the Yiddish press, and of modern literature. The longest chapters are devoted, as one would expect, to "Dialect Geography" and the "History of Yiddish" (chapter 12). It is curious that all onomastic studies are diachronic in nature. Under "History" we find also the puzzling title of section IX (p. 37): "German in Yiddish Transcription." Since there is no section dealing with the history of Yiddish graphemics (except for the Standard rules of orthography and transcription in chapter 3), the authors should have stated in the Introduction what is meant by Yiddish transcription of older German texts, unless the Yiddish is simply a misprint for Hebrew.

The Bibliography is intended primarily as an introduction to the study of Yiddish linguistics and folklore. But its wider significance for general linguistics is most convincingly phrased by the authors themselves in their Introduction: it provides "material for the study of such problems as the splitting up and fusion of languages, the dialectological articulation of coteritorial languages, the impact of religious separateness on language, the

evolution of new literary languages under unusual conditions." To any linguist interested in the above problems, this volume will be an indispensable tool.

Edward Stankiewicz
Indiana University

This brief account of Yiddish folklore (Nos. 254-481) will serve for preliminary orientation in a field strewn with bibliographical difficulties. The titles are cited with sufficient details, but it would have been helpful to have indicated the number of pages in books and the number of tales, songs, or proverbs in collections. A few words of description and criticism would also have been helpful, but only Ausubel's Treasury (No. 272) is accompanied by comment (the citation of a review). References to No. 280, Mitteilungen zur jüdischen Volkskunde (1898-1929), the standard journal which is not too difficult to consult, are limited to articles by Grunwald (Nos. 286, 301, 479), while other journals much more difficult to come by are excerpted more freely. In general, the titles cited deal with Yiddish folklore, and exceptions to the rule need not be objected to. If, however, Ginzberg, Legends of the Jews (No. 354) and Dov Noy, Motif-Index of Talmudic-Midrashic Literature (No. 361) are admitted (and I should not exclude them), then M. J. bin Gorion, Der Born Judas (3rd ed., 6 vols., Leipzig, n. d.); Moses Gaster, The Exempla of the Rabbis (London, 1924); and the excellent survey of "Hebräisches Märchen" in J. Bolte and G. Polívka, Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen, IV, 315-364, ought to be included. The failure to cite the bibliography of Yiddish tales in the Anmerkungen, V, 21-24, is regrettable. I would scarcely have separated "tales" from "humor" as widely as is done here and would have hesitated about including Freud's Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious (No. 405), when the limits are so closely drawn as to exclude M. Grünbaum, Jüdisch-deutsche Chrestomathie (Leipzig, 1882). The arrangement of the bibliography suggests comparison of the work done in various fields. Tales have been collected in generous quantity, but investigations are few. Songs have also been collected in generous quantity, but investigation has been almost exclusively concerned with musical aspects. The collection and investigation of proverbs have progressed hand in hand and have yielded good results. If "background materials" are to be cited, then Israel Cohen, Parallel Proverbs in English, German and Hebrew (Tel Aviv, 1954) should be mentioned here.

Archer Taylor
University of California (Berkeley)

Dennis Ward, Russian Pronunciation: A Practical Course. New York: Hafner Publ. Co., 1958. x, 90, \$2.50.

As the title indicates, this book aims to satisfy practical needs, rather than to treat the Russian phonetic system from a strictly descriptive viewpoint. Russian Pronunciation might be

used in several ways: as a textbook for a special course in Russian phonetics, as a reference handbook for students enrolled in a traditional course, or as a pedagogical guide for instructors.

This book consists of an introduction to general phonetics, several chapters describing the vowel and consonant sounds of Russian, a section on special words (compounds, words made up of initials, foreign words, proper names, numerals, etc.), an appendix with passages for reading practice, and a short bibliography.

Russian Pronunciation is typical of the British phonetic tradition. (The author is Lecturer in Russian at the University of Edinburgh.) The sounds of Russian are described carefully, with some excellent suggestions for acquiring a fluent pronunciation.

No reference is made to phonemic theory. The peculiarities of R. P., General American, and Scots speakers are taken into account, and special instructions are given for each group. One interesting innovation in this book is the use of a Cyrillic phonetic transcription, similar to the one employed by Soviet linguists.

Several shortcomings of Russian Pronunciation must be noted. No diagrams are provided to illustrate the various positions of the vocal organs described by the author. The most glaring omission in the book is the absence of any description regarding the intonational system of Russian. To be sure, Russian intonation is a difficult subject, and much basic research remains to be done. However, any specialized work on the applied phonetics of a language should describe at least the very basic intonational patterns of it. Undoubtedly, the preparation of records or tapes to accompany the text would prove most beneficial and help fill this gap.

Although Russian Pronunciation compares favorably with American textbooks on the same subject, it will not replace the more complete work of Boyanus, especially for intermediate and advanced work.

Thomas F. Magner. The Russian Alphabet. St. Paul, Minn.: EMC Recordings Corp., 1959. 24pp., \$1.00.

This booklet serves as a guide for students who are learning to read and write the letters of the Russian alphabet. It provides a variety of exercises in writing and printing on perforated sheets, which can be removed and handed to the instructor. Only the barest essentials of pronunciation are covered.

The Russian Alphabet might be a suitable teaching aid for an introductory high school course prior to the use of a regular textbook. However, most instructors probably prefer to take up the sound system of Russian at the same time as the writing system, and some take up the sound system first.

Only a few minor defects were noted in The Russian Alphabet. The word zakaz (p. 2) is a confusing example for z since the second z is phonetically [s]. Strictly speaking, the Russian alphabet does not have 32 letters. It has 33: since 1943 ë has been an official letter by decree of the Ministry of Education. The phonetic representation of the letter names for b, v, g, l and p omits softening (pp. 7-8). The most recent Academy dictionaries, however, indicate that these letter names are phonetically [b'e],

[v'e], [g'e], [el'], and [p'e]. The stresses on byvšij (p. 15) and umor (p. 16) are missing.

Nicholas Maltzoff. Pattern Drills in Russian. New York: Pitman Publ. Corporation, 1960. vii, 72 pp.

This book is intended as a supplement to the regular grammar text in a beginning course. It provides material for concentrated oral drill on key Russian grammatical constructions. The exercises are arranged as follows. On the left side of each page is listed a group of expressions. On the right side another list is given. Each expression in either list can be combined with any expression on the opposite side of the page to form a complete sentence. The last section of the text is a workbook, where the student has to make the proper fill-ins.

This book creates an excellent impression. In the hands of a competent instructor, it appears to be an eminently suitable teaching aid for classroom or laboratory drill. The author has carefully selected those Russian syntactical patterns which require most drill. The vocabulary is small. No errata were noted.

The author and publisher have produced a book which was long overdue.

Nicholas Maltzoff. Russian Reading and Conversation. 2nd ed. New York: Pitman Publ. Corp., 1959. vi, 156, \$2.50.

This book is designed for students who are already familiar with the essentials of Russian grammar. It contains thirty-three chapters and a general vocabulary. Each chapter consists of a conversation on a specific subject and a story based on the conversation. Vocabularies are provided for both sections of the lesson. The book seems best suited for conversation and simple composition.

Russian Reading and Conversation makes a good impression. The conversations and vocabularies are generally well done. There is only one criticism to make of the vocabularies. They do not provide vital morphological information, which every vocabulary of Russian should give: the stress pattern of each noun and the conjugation of each irregular verb. One other suggestion for future editions would be to supply supplementary vocabulary lists for the various subjects treated in the book. Students are able to learn terms easily when the latter are closely related to each other.

George Z. Patrick. Elementary Russian Reader. 2nd ed., revised by Ludmilla A. Patrick. New York: Pitman Publ. Corp., 1959. viii, 231, \$3.00.

The selections in this reader are divided into three parts. The first consists of children's stories and fables. The second is made up of readings on Russian geography and history. The third part is devoted to biographies of famous Russian authors.

The Elementary Russian Reader, unfortunately, does not indicate clearly the sources from which its selections were taken. If these sources were described adequately, the reader

would be better prepared for the sometimes jarring juxtaposition of Soviet and non-Soviet material.

Many of the selections in this book are very suitable for either the college or high school level. Others seem rather juvenile. This does not apply only to the fables. The biography of Catherine the Second, for example, depicts her as a modest, clean-living, virtuous monarch, whose reign brought nothing but bliss to Russia. Some of the other biographies are also naïve eulogies.

The Russian used in the Reader is excellent. Misprints are practically nil. The vocabulary is well done, except for its failure to supply data on noun stress.

Mario Pei and Fedor I. Nikanov. Getting Along in Russian. (A Holiday Magazine Language Book.) New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. viii, 260, \$3.50.

N. C. Stepanoff. Say It in Russian. 3rd ed. New York: Dover Publ., Inc., 1958. 175 pp., \$.75.

These phrase and word books have been written primarily for American travelers to the U.S.S.R. Both books offer vocabulary and typical sentences for various spheres of activity. The Pei book has a more imposing and expensive format. The Stepanoff book has the practical advantage of being pocket-sized. Either of these books could be of great value to an American tourist.

The one serious defect of both books is their cumbersome, incorrect, grossly confusing systems of phonetic transcription. Pei, for example, transcribes čaj 'tea' as cheye (p. 122). Stepanoff transcribes rastjaženie 'sprain' as rahs-tyah-ZHY [sic] EH-nee-yeh (p. 142). Any detailed criticism of these transcriptions would be a thankless task. It certainly would be less confusing if the authors had provided a simple phonemic transcription which utilizes the generally known European vowel-letter values.

Miscellaneous errors occur in both books. Here are several noted in Getting Along in Russian. The last consonant in sakvojaž should be phonetically transcribed as devoiced (p. 25). The soft sign in piat'sot is missing (p. 27). The city name Smolensk should be stressed on the second syllable (p. 33). The plural kruževa should be stressed on the ultimate (p. 78). The instrumental of lokot is loktem and not lokotem (p. 94). The genitive plural of olivka should be olivok and not olivkov (p. 106).

Several mistakes in terminology also occur, especially in the section on automobiles. Soviet Russian speakers would say zabronirovannoe or numerovannoe mesto for 'reserved seat' rather than reservirovannoe mesto (p. 40). The usual equivalent of 'gasoline station' is zapravočnaja stancija and not benzinnaja stancija (p. 45). The most frequently used Soviet Russian term for 'traffic light' is svetofor and not svetovoj signal (ibid.). An automobile 'clutch' is sceplenie and not korobka skorostej (p. 46). The latter actually means 'transmission.' An automobile 'fuel pump' is normally nasos rather than pompa (p. 49). The form far 'headlight' is not correct for the nominative singular (p. 50). It should be fara. An automobile 'hood' is not pokryška (which normally means 'tire' when referring to an automobile) but kapot (p. 51).

Examples of mistakes encountered in Say It in Russian follow. The sentence skol'ko vremeni berët doexat' do . . . 'how long will it take to go to . . . ' (p. 35) reveals English influence. Correct Russian would be skol'ko vremeni ponadobitsja, čtoby doexat' do The best translation of 'windshield wiper' is stekloočistitel' rather than očistitel' perednego okna (p. 58). The compounds desjatkopejčnyj (p. 65) and polbulytki (p. 81) should not be broken up into two words. Russians do not pronounce koktej'l' with English phonemes (p. 77). The gender of kofe is masculine rather than neuter (p. 102). The Russian equivalent of (bone) 'fracture' is perelom rather than polom (p. 146).

Morton Benson
University of Pennsylvania

Noah D. Gershevsky. Scientific Russian Reader: Selected Modern Readings in Chemistry and Physics. New York: Pitman Publ. Corp. [c. 1960]. xxii, 266, \$4.00.

The twelve years between the two editions of Professor Gershevsky's pioneering book have seen a fantastic growth of interest in Russian science. This interest is directly responsible for the governmental and institutional largesse now being extended to Russian studies, which previously suffered from a type of academic pellagra. It is to the author's credit that he recognized the problem ab ovo and first developed this textbook back in the "lean days."

Basically, the present edition consists of 130 short unaccented selections from chemistry and physics, arranged in order of difficulty. A typical text is about fifteen lines in length, followed first by a few notes explaining difficult constructions and then by a short glossary of the technical terms used. At the end of the book there is an accented Russian-English glossary, which contains "almost all" of the words used in the constituent texts. Additional offerings are a list of Symbols of Chemical Elements, a table of Russian-English equivalents for weights and measures, and an index of the subjects dealt with in the various texts.

The changes in this second edition are not many: a new cover with an emblazoned sputnik, an inserted paragraph in the Preface, two new texts in the chemistry section, and two more in the physics section.

The imperfections of this work are mostly of a minor nature, though I am disturbed by the cavalier way in which the author relates participles and gerunds to infinitives, sometimes to the relevant aspect, but just as often not. Thus, on page 65 he correctly assigns the past passive participle pogružennyj to pogruzit', while sokraščennyj is linked to sokraščat', instead of a correct sokratit'. Examples of this aspectual inexactitude abound. Precision in stating such relationships is perhaps not important for a native speaker of Russian, since he controls the forms without adverting to them, but the student of written Russian must depend on whatever systematic relationships the new language offers. The author's table of symbols, with its 92 elements, does not reflect the march of science, which has now reached

102 (nobelium); it should also be noted that the Russian symbol for thulium is not our Tm but Tu, their only deviation from the general scheme.

New or old, this is a sound, carefully worked-out textbook, and I recommend it as a helpful aid for American scientists attempting to familiarize themselves with the achievements of their Russian counterparts.

Thomas F. Magner
Pennsylvania State University

Leon Stilman. Graded Readings in Russian History: The Formation of the Russian State. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. viii, 93, \$2.50.

This book of graded readings prepared by Professor Leon Stilman of Columbia University is designed for the second year of a Russian language course or the second semester of an intensive course. The various brief sections deal with the geography and history of Russia through the reign of Ivan III. Each section is followed by a list of the words first used in that section, in the order in which the words appear, by questions in Russian on the context of the section, and by sentences in English for translation into Russian. The volume also contains a full vocabulary of all words used, as well as four maps.

This is a tested and effective reader of particular value for those interested in Russian history and in the social sciences.

Robert F. Byrnes
Indiana University

A. P. Okladnikov. Ancient Population of Siberia and Its Cultures. (Russian Translation Series of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard Univ., Vol. I, No. 1.) Cambridge, Mass., 1959. vii, 96 pp.

A. P. Okladnikov's short paper, published in a series inaugurated by the Peabody Museum, gives us a survey of the prehistory of Siberia from the Upper Palaeolithic period to the first millennium A. D. It deals with the cultures of prehistoric Siberia, follows their evolution through the ages, and even traces some similarities between ethnographic materials of nineteenth century Siberia and the prehistoric populations.

The accompanying maps indicating Palaeolithic settlements and boundaries of maximum glaciation, Neolithic cultures of Siberia, and Palaeolithic and Mesolithic sites in the U.S.S.R., are very helpful but do not make up for the lack of a chronological and topical table of the succeeding cultures in such a vast area. As Dr. Gimbutas has already pointed out in her studies, the datings of prehistoric cultures by Russian scholars represent arbitrary guesses. This seems to be true also in the present case, and Okladnikov's dates for Mesolithic and (Sub)neolithic

cultures of Siberia have to be taken with extreme caution: all of them tend to be too high.

Okladnikov brings out convincingly that the Upper Palaeolithic inhabitants of Eastern Siberia came to the shores of Lake Baikal from Eastern Europe during the Magdalenian period. His arguments become untenable when he is fighting with intense vehemence against the possibility of the influence of intrusive Eastern Asiatic chopper-tool traditions on the blade-tool culture of the Upper Palaeolithic in Eastern Siberia. Heavy scrapers reproduced on his Plate 4 point unmistakably to the chopper-tool traditions of Eastern Asia. The merging of two traditions in Eastern Siberia would also help to elucidate some of the puzzles of the ethnogenesis of Siberian populations. The origin of the "Sibirid race," considered by E. von Eickstedt a "contact race" between the Europids and Mongolids, would find a logical solution. It would also explain the linguistic chasm that separates the tonal Sino-Tibetan languages from the polysyllabic and agglutinative Altaic languages, as well as from Yukagir and Chukchi-Koryak tongues.

Most interesting is Okladnikov's observation that the (Sub)neolithic Ob Culture spreads later eastward, far beyond the Ob, reaching Yenisei and taking then a southward direction. He points out that the Ob or Western Siberian Culture shows close affinities with the Neolithic cultures west of the Urals and in the Northern Baltic regions. This fact has been pointed out before by Indreko, and with the help of Okladnikov's Map 2 it is possible to interpret it in the broader context of Western Siberian ethnogenesis. Okladnikov is inclined to see in the carriers of the Ob Culture the ancestors of modern Ostyaks and Voguls. Unfortunately, this assumption is not supported by linguistic and historic evidence. Finno-Ugric languages have never been spoken so far east and south of Siberia. On the other hand, one can very well accept the thesis that Obians were Uralians, but of the Samoyedic branch. In the nineteenth century Samoyedic languages were spoken from the Sayan mountains in the south (Sayan Samoyedic) to the farthest north, and on the both shores of the lower Yenisei. During the Subneolithic Ob Culture the ancestors of the Ugrians (Voguls, Ostyaks, and Hungarians) were probably still living west of the Urals and can be tentatively identified with the populations of Okladnikov's Šigir culture.

From the point of view of American prehistory Okladnikov's Map 1 proves invaluable. The indicated boundaries of the maximum glaciation in Siberia tend to corroborate the surmise that earliest immigration of men into America via Alaska and Chukchi peninsula must have followed a southern route on the North-east Asiatic continent, i. e., along the shores of the Sea of Okhotsk or via the Kurile Islands and Kamchatka.

The translation, on the whole, is accurate and readable. Only in some minor points the terminology used by the translator is prone to convey a wrong idea to the Western reader. The term "throwing stones" (p. 4) is used in context with the batons de commandement; the term "spear thrower" or "atlatl" should have been used instead. The term "northern deer" is apparently a calque from Russian severnij olen', i. e., reindeer (Rangifer sp.); on the other hand "common deer" stands for (Asiatic) red deer, i. e., Cervus elaphus subsp. Throughout the book the word "elk" is used in its English and continental sense,

and means for American readers moose (Alces alces subsp.) not wapiti (Cervus canadensis). The same way "mountain goat" on p. 37 does not stand for Oreamnus americanus, but means ibex (Capra sp.).

Okladnikov's work is a fine and very condensed summary of the results of archaeological research effectuated by Russian scholars in Northern Asia. The Peabody Museum is to be complimented for the decision to include it in the Russian Translation Series.

Viktor Kõressaar
New York Public Library

Roman Illytzyk. Deutschland und Ukraine, 1934-1945: Tatsachen europäischer Ostpolitik, I-II. München: Osteuropa-Institut, 1958. 383 and 438 pp.

Illytzyk's books were prepared in the Osteuropa-Institut, under the guidance of its director, the late renowned historian on Eastern Europe, Professor Hans Koch. They belong to the most important recent publications written in a Western language about the Ukraine and her importance in East European politics.

The documents of the first volume are explained in an Introduction, which gives a historical survey of the events and often exceeds the scope of the documentation itself. It would have been desirable to present more documents on Polish and Soviet politics in the Ukraine between the two world wars, as well as on the Hungarian occupation of the Carpatho-Ukraine.

In the first volume the author presents four plans of German East European politics: Rosenberg's plan, Hitler's plan — which was the most brutal though only partially disclosed at the time — and two theoretical plans: the colonial politics of Frauenfeld and that of former Soviet General Vlasov. Two prewar German conceptions of Haushofer and Rohrbach could have been mentioned in addition. Illytzyk also characterizes the policies of the different Ukrainian political groups, their hopes, struggles, and disappointments between the two world wars, and the Ukrainian attitude toward German policy before and during World War II. In speaking of the Russianization, collectivization, and the industrialization of the Ukraine, some figures could have been presented to illustrate the facts. The brief remarks about the Ukrainian National Republic in exile and the Hetman (monarchist) movement should have included the Promethean idea of the liberation of the non-Russian nationalities (initiated by Roman Smal-Stocki) and the ideology of Vyacheslav Lypynsky.

Perhaps Chapter III of the first volume, which is based on the published documents of German foreign policy, the Nuremberg trial, etc., is the most interesting. Here Illytzyk treats the sly tactics of Hitler in skillfully using the Ukrainian problem to attract and to scare Poland and Soviet Russia, or to disguise his East European policy in the international play with England and France. In this connection, the author stresses the shortsightedness of Polish policy toward the Ukraine, a policy which unwittingly complied with Hitler's plans and contributed to the

doom of nationalistic Poland. The West, even England, who is usually well informed on foreign problems, wavered between the appeasement of the dictator, sometimes pretending to give him a free hand in Eastern Europe and sometimes making efforts to curtail him.

The second volume deals with the events of World War II in the Ukraine. The short-lived Rosenberg plan of political reconstruction of Eastern Europe after the eventual defeat of the Soviet Union and the more brutal Hitler-Himmler-Göring plan, which replaced it, are treated in detail. The picture of Ukrainian resistance and Nazi revenge is painted with good although incomplete documentation.

Illytzyk's work represents an important contribution to political literature on Eastern Europe. It is rendered even more useful by the added bibliography and index.

John P. Pauls
University of Cincinnati

Negley Farson. The Lost World of the Caucasus. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1958. 154pp., \$4.00.

It was refreshing to read and reread the fascinating account of Negley Farson's travelings in the Caucasus, a trip full of hardships and requiring immense endurance. Farson and his companion Alexander Wicksteed saw things themselves, had the closest contact with various Caucasian nationalities, and succeeded in obtaining first-hand information on the people of the Caucasus.

Farson traveled in the Caucasus twice, in 1928 and again in 1929, but he wrote his book only after learning about the cruel revenge Stalin took in 1944 upon the Kalmucks, Karačais, Bal-kars, Ingus, and other Caucasian nationalities. Their deportation to Siberia, the complete ruination of their settlements deeply hurt Farson, and he felt that he owed these people words of truth; he spoke for those who were made silent.

Farson presents to Western readers many other things of which they have only a slight idea. His description of the sad fate of the Kalmucks, their deportation to Siberia, the scattering of the remnants all over the world, is accurate. He does not mention the interesting point that those lucky Kalmucks who managed to escape, settled not only in Paraguay, but also in Farson's native country, the U.S. A. A large community of the Kalmucks settled in New Jersey, in Freewood Acres, where they even have their Buddhist temple and a native school for children, and where the Xutuxtu, their Great Lama, and some other lamas reside.

Describing the conquest of the Caucasus by the Russians, Farson again shows his excellent grasp of historical events, and he departs from one-sided descriptions of the conquest, so frequent in the Western world. He pays tribute to Russian aristocrats, officers of the Tsarist army, for their unselfish deeds, courage, and lack of material aspirations. Farson also displays a deep knowledge of the great Russian writers — Tolstoj,

Puškin, and Lermontov — all of whom fell in love with this beautiful land and its colorful, freedom-loving people, and made them and their Caucasus immortal in Russian literature.

Farson shows a good knowledge of the ethnic composition of the Caucasus. He is however slightly mistaken in seeing Mongolian features in ethnically typical Caucasian peoples. The Kabardians and Karačais, being of Turkic descent, naturally bear traces of the High-Asiatic racial type, but the great majority of the peoples there is definitely Caucasian. In general, the Mongolians play a rather mythical role in Farson's book. In his description of Rimskij-Korsakov's beautiful melodies depicting the steppes of Central Asia, he says: "I was seeing the Golden Horde moving across the mounded plains by the Amur River." In point of fact, the Golden Horde never reached the Amur River.

Farson's book is a remarkable description not only of the people and nature of the Caucasus, but also of the Russian people whom he met while traveling along the Volga River. It is clear from the entire book that his heart is with the Caucasus and its wonderful people, although he was moved by the deep affection of the Russian people toward their children and noticed other human sides of Russians which have nothing to do with the present political regime.

Western readers have to be thankful to Farson for his true presentation of facts from a region which is lost for us. Nobody can travel now in the Caucasus with the comparative freedom Farson had. He has made a wonderful tribute to the Caucasian peoples, whose fate has become so tragic.

Natalie Chorna-Menges
New York

BRIEF NOTICES

Jozsef Kovago. You Are All Alone. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. 295 pp., \$6.00.

A valuable addition to the ever-growing literature about the Hungarian revolution, this book tells the story from the standpoint of a man who was twice elected Mayor of Budapest in free postwar elections before the Communist seizure of power in Hungary, who suffered imprisonment and torture from 1950 until only a few weeks before the outbreak of the revolution, and who then joined the forces of the revolution and was elected once again Mayor of a free Budapest on November 1, 1956.

Robert A. Fearey. The U.S. Versus the U.S.S.R.: Ideologies in Conflict. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1959]. vi, 48 pp.

The purpose of this brief monograph is to trace the origins and development of both the Western and Soviet ideologies, to set forth the main tenets of both American and Soviet ideological belief, to assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two systems of belief, and finally, to recommend ways of more

efficient conduct by us of "the ideological aspects of the Cold War conflict." Apart from the enormity of this assignment for coverage in forty-eight pages, one is bothered by the implication that the West has a system of belief. If there is any ideological difference between Russia and the West that the West must hold onto at all cost, it is the absence of a "Western ideology."

Raymond L. Garthoff. The Soviet Image of Future War. Introd. General James M. Gavin. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1959]. xiii, 137, \$3.25.

Written by the foremost American authority on Soviet military doctrine, author of Soviet Military Doctrine and Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age, this little book makes a further important contribution to its subject by presenting the results of research on recent Soviet thinking about decisive factors in modern war, the role of surprise and blitzkrieg, the character of contemporary war, and the development of Soviet military science. While more limited in scope than the two previous books, it sheds significant fresh light on numerous aspects of contemporary Soviet military thought.

Nikolai Khokhlov. In the Name of Conscience. New York: David McKay Co. [c. 1959]. xi, 365, \$4.50.

The case of Nikolai Khokhlov is one of the most dramatic episodes in recent years involving the defection of a Soviet secret agent. According to his story, related here in detail, his defection was a product of revolt against a regime that had ordered him abroad for the express purpose of murdering an anti-Soviet Russian émigré leader. The story is well told and the translation, by Emily Kingsbery, reads quite smoothly.

Peter Deriabin and Grank Gibney. The Secret World. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1959. 334pp., \$4.50.

Deriabin, another Soviet secret police operative who defected to the West, has produced an account of his life and experiences that will be of greater interest and use to the Soviet specialist than the Khokhlov book. It offers considerably more information about the organization of the Soviet secret police, and gives a broader, more analytic account of developments in the Soviet world.

Isaac Don Levine. The Mind of an Assassin. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy [c. 1959]. xvii, 232, \$4.50.

In Mexico recently the murderer of Leon Trockiij was released from prison after serving twenty years of imprisonment for the crime. This book is an attempt at imaginative reconstruction of the circumstances behind the crime and analysis of the identity and personal history of the assassin. It is based upon a great deal of empirical research that took the author on many trips to Mexico, and upon a four-volume study by the criminologist-psychologist for the Mexican Department of Justice, Professor Jose Gomez Robléda, who conducted daily

six-hour interviews with the assassin over a period of six months. The psychologist and criminologist as well as the sovietologist will find much of interest in this study.

Alex Inkeles and Raymond A. Bauer. The Soviet Citizen: Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society. (Russian Research Center Studies, 35.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. xx, 533, \$10.00.

This is the full report of the Harvard Project on the Soviet Social System, which sought to discover new information on and more systematic understanding of the Soviet system by interviewing approximately three thousand former Soviet citizens living abroad. It is the first and only such study in existence, and contains a wealth of material that will be of interest to the specialist in Soviet affairs. It must be realized that the attitudes and experiences tapped by the interviews related largely to the 1930's and beginning of the 1940's, since which time the persons interviewed have, for the most part, resided outside the Soviet Union.

Leo Gruliow, ed. Current Soviet Policies, III: The Documentary Record of the Extraordinary 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. xiii, 230, \$6.00.

This is an addition to the series of documentary records of Soviet Communist Party Congresses begun with Current Soviet Policies, I, a record of the nineteenth Congress in 1952. It is based on translations originally published in the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, and is prefaced by a useful though brief explanatory essay by the editor, Leo Gruliow. A Who's Who of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, compiled by Mark Neuwend, forms a valuable appendix. The Twenty-First Congress was "extraordinary" only in the sense of not being a regularly scheduled meeting. The materials lack the historical importance of those of both of the two preceding congresses of 1952 and 1956, but are an integral component of the full story of Soviet political history in recent years.

George G. Guins. Communism on the Decline. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. ix, 287 pp.

This belongs to a species of book that seems to be vanishing in the Western scholarly world: the total view of Russia under communism, combining the historical, legal, philosophical, sociological, and political aspects. As such it is no worse than many that have preceded it, but is not marked by fresh insights or methods or analytical tools. Though it argues that Communism in Russia has reached a stage "characterized by symptoms of a progressive decay," it contains no predictions regarding the future. The author maintains that "The decay of Communism starts when its achievements cease to satisfy people, when its promises do not raise enthusiasm, and its infallibility becomes exposed; when people begin to understand that the Communist philosophy is based on illusions and its regime is vicious and

despotic." On these criteria, it would be necessary to say that the process of decay started in the 1920's.

F. Cyril James. On Understanding Russia. [Toronto] Univ. of Toronto Press [c. 1959]. ix, 63, \$2.95.

The author of this slight volume, who is Principal and Vice-Chancellor of McGill University, reports on impressions derived from a month's journey to the Soviet Union with a group of American educators. The essays, reprinted in substantially the form in which they first appeared in the Montreal Daily Star, deal mainly with problems of Soviet education, culture and religion. It is, given the inherent limitations of the genre, a good job — sober, clearly written, and full of well-ordered information.

Robert C. Tucker
Indiana University

Brison D. Gooch. The New Bonapartist Generals in the Crimean War: Distrust and Decision-Making in the Anglo-French Alliance. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1959. ii, 289, f. 19.

This is a study by a young American scholar of French military leadership at the highest levels before and during the Crimean War. It is based on thorough research in published materials available in this country, especially the correspondence of the French civilian and military leaders, and it provides a considerable amount of information concerning Napoleon III's system of rule and the conduct of the French army in the Crimea.

Unfortunately, the volume has a number of notable shortcomings. Professor Gooch betrays no real knowledge of military affairs, so that the issues which faced the French and British leaders are not described clearly. Gooch asserts that the experience in Algeria of Napoleon III's generals was important, but he does not explain this; his comments on the Napoleonic Legend and on the decline of Napoleon's influence in French military thought show that he does not understand the legend or the military principles of Napoleon I. In the conclusion, in particular, the effort to connect the disasters of 1870 to the military leadership of the 1850's reflects both a lack of information on military affairs in that era and a curious failure to provide evidence concerning French leadership in the Franco-Prussian war.

Professor Gooch apparently does not read Russian, and The New Bonapartist Generals therefore contains no views on French strategy or action from the Russian side, except where translations were available. Indeed, the Russian effort in the war escapes notice.

Professor Gooch writes in a most careless, inaccurate, and awkward style, as one or two examples will illustrate: "Diagnosed as cancer of the intestines (perhaps also angina), doctors disagreed about his fitness for the trip to Constantinople" (p. 77), and "After demonstrating that he was a person of some political

acumen, the movement towards empire was not an illogical process" (p. 35).

Maps would have been most useful. Indeed, the publisher should be reprimanded for producing a book in military history without a single map.

Robert F. Byrnes
Indiana University

W. W. Rostow. The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1960. xi, 179, \$1.45.

This is a remarkable essay written in the grand historical manner. It is structured mostly with abstractions, with little resort to empirical evidence. Some might like the broad sweep of manifestos. Some others might prefer more modest constructs solidly buttressed. This reviewer does not intend to choose sides in this particular respect.

Professor Rostow separates the whole sweep of Western economic development into two basic parts: pre- and post-Galilean (Professor Rostow calls, erroneously I believe, the two parts pre- and post-Newtonian). Roughly, up to Galileo, the West lived in "traditional" societies whose pre-scientific technology put ceilings on their productivity. With Galileo, the West entered into the scientific era and passed from then on through the following stages: the stage of the preparation of the "take-off," in which society transforms itself in order to exploit the fruits of modern science; the "take-off" stage, in which technology is applied to a narrow group of industries; the stage of maturity, or of the extension of technology to all economic activity; and, finally, the "age of high mass consumption" and of the "welfare state." There are thus five stages: one which encompasses the whole prescientific era, and four which form together the scientific era. In Professor Rostow's comparison the world is likened, so to speak, to a huge airport in which some presumably old-model planes are motionless on the ground; some planes are warming up and are ready to, or have already taken off; some are finally in full flight into maturity, while some others have reached the dizzy heights of "mass consumption." As is usually the case with metaphors, this one cannot be pushed to its ultimate conclusions. One wonders where one would fly once "mass consumption" is reached. In the Introduction to his book, Professor Rostow indicates that he will tell us where growth by "geometric progression" is taking us: "... to Communism, ... to affluent suburbs ... to destruction, to the moon or where?" (p. 2). But his answer is not quite conclusive. He does tell at the end of his book that we can and should "hasten the day" when "the age of high mass consumption becomes universal." This of course tells us where the non-Western flights might eventually go, but doesn't tell us where we are supposed to go.

It is impossible to do justice to this book in a few short lines. It is certainly a very stimulating essay which deserves to be read carefully.

Robert L. Allen. Soviet Economic Warfare. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1960]. x, 293, \$5.00.

This book is based upon the vast preparatory research work done by the author and by some twenty other scholars who worked under his direction between 1956 and 1959 on a project on Soviet bloc Foreign Relations, conducted at the University of Virginia. The work falls into three main parts: (1) organization of Soviet state trading and its role as an instrument of "economic warfare"; (2) main trends in Soviet foreign economic relations (i. e., trade and credits); (3) impact of the latter in various areas of the world, and the prospects.

The author's basic thesis is that political motives remain the mainspring of Soviet moves, but that of course economic capabilities determine the kind, scope, and magnitude of foreign economic relations. The prospect concerning these relations depends ultimately on the Soviet Union's assignment of economic priorities — i. e., on its schedule of aims. Trends in foreign trade illustrate the position of the latter in the Soviet Union's set of objectives; the implementation of trade itself illustrates, for its part, how political and economic considerations are welded together.

The book will prove useful to all those interested in the connections between Soviet economy and Soviet power.

N. Spulber
Indiana University

Oleksander Ohloblyn. Het'man Ivan Mazepa ta joho doba. (Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Shevchenka, tom 170.) New York, Paris, Toronto: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1960. 406 pp.

"Hetman Ivan Mazepa was totally dedicated to the ideal of Ukrainian statehood, and to the ideal of a united Ukrainian independent state," writes Oleksander Ohloblyn, a well-known Ukrainian historian, in the English-language summary to his new book, Het'man Ivan Mazepa ta joho doba. The quotation above can serve as the key word to this extensive, well-documented and up-to-date study.

After the independent Kozak-Hetman state under Hetman Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj was ruined, following his death, Mazepa pursued the course of coexistence with Muscovy — the only way in the most unfavorable and complicated circumstances. A great patriot of Ukrainia, he largely succeeded in raising Ukrainian culture as well as her economy during his long reign. This echoed his efforts in establishing a lasting Hetmanite authority which, inevitably, led toward a unity of all Ukrainian lands, including those taken over by Poland and Turkey. Mazepa's shifting to the side of Charles XII of Sweden, conducting the war against Peter the Great of Russia, was not a surprise but, according to Ohloblyn, a logical development of the ideas of independence which originated under Xmel'nyc'kyj and were spread among Mazepa's adherents and followers. On the eve of the Swedish-Russian war, they seemed to be approaching a full realization.

Ohloblyn has performed a noteworthy task; by his study he not only commemorates the two hundred fiftieth year of the death of Hetman Ivan Mazepa, great Ukrainian statesman, but also contributes to a fuller understanding of the history of Eastern Europe and Ukrainian-Russian political relations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The book has been published under the auspices of the Organization for Defense of Four Freedoms of Ukraina.

Yar Slavutych
University of Alberta

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Robert L. Allen. Soviet Economic Warfare. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1960]. x, 293, \$5.00.
- R. Auty. Handbook of Old Church Slavonic, II: Texts and Glossary. (London East European Series.) London: University of London, The Athlone Press, 1960. x, 148, 42s.
- Raymond A. Bauer, et al. How the Soviet System Works: Cultural, Psychological, and Social Themes. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1004.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. xvi, 312, xii, \$1.25.
- [M. S. Bodnarskij.] Russian-English Geographical Encyclopedia. New York: Telberg Book Co. [n.d.] x, 142 pp.
- [M. B. Bolostnova, comp.] Dictionary of Russian Geographical Names. Tr. T. Deruguine. Second printing. New York: Telberg Book Co. [c. 1958.] iii, 82 pp.
- Nelson Brooks. Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. [c. 1960]. xiii, 238, \$3.50.
- Canadian Slavonic Papers, IV. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1959. vi, 217, \$6.00.
- Isaac Deutscher. Stalin: A Political Biography. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1003.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. xxiii, 600, \$1.65.
- Fyodor Dostoevsky. Notes from Underground and The Grand Inquisitor. Selection, tr. and intr. Ralph E. Matlaw. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1960. xxiii, 229, \$1.45.
- Ivo D. Duchacek, with the collaboration of Kenneth W. Thompson. Conflict and Cooperation Among Nations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston [c. 1960]. xvi, 649, \$6.50.
- Ethnographic Map of the South-Western Ukraine (Halyčyna-Galicia). With Introductory Notes by V. Kubijovyč (15 pp.). (Memoirs of the Ševčenko Scientific Society, CLX.) New York, 1953.
- Robert A. Fearey. The U.S. Versus the U.S.S.R.: Ideologies in Conflict. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1959]. vi, 48 pp.

- Raymond L. Garthoff. The Soviet Image of Future War. Introd. General James M. Gavin. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1959]. xiii, 137, \$3.25.
- George Gibian. Interval of Freedom: Soviet Literature During the Thaw, 1954-57. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press [c. 1960]. xi, 180, \$4.25.
- Ivan Goncharov. Oblomov. Tr. Natalie Duddington, Intr. Renato Poggioli. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1960. xxv, 517, \$1.85.
- Andre von Gronicka and Helen Bates-Yakobson. Essentials of Russian: Pronunciation, Conversation and Comprehension. 12-inch long-playing record and 54 page manual. New York: Dover Publications [c. 1959]. \$4.95 (the set).
- Leo Grulicow, ed. Current Soviet Policies, III: The Documentary Record of the Extraordinary 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. xiii, 230, \$6.00.
- Morris Halle. The Sound Pattern of Russian: A Linguistic and Acoustical Investigation. With an Excursus on The Contextual Variants of the Russian Vowels by Lawrence G. Jones. (Description and Analysis of Contemporary Standard Russian, I.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1959. 206 pp., f. 40.
- F. Cyril James. On Understanding Russia. [Toronto] Univ. of Toronto Press [c. 1959]. ix, 63, \$2.95.
- Robert A. Kann. A Study in Austrian Intellectual History: From Late Baroque to Romanticism. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1960]. xxii, 367, \$6.00.
- Alternur Kilic. Turkey and the World. Intr. William O. Douglas. Washington: Public Affairs Press [c. 1959]. 224 pp., \$4.50.
- Joseph M. Kirschbaum. Slovakia: Nation at the Crossroads of Central Europe. New York: Robert Speller and Sons [c. 1960]. xix, 371, \$5.00.
- Stanislaw Kot. Georges Niemirycz et la lutte contre l'intolérance au 17^e siècle. (Musagetes, VIII.) 'S-Gravenhage, 1960. 78 pp.
- Ludwik Krzyżanowski, ed. Joseph Conrad: Centennial Essays. New York: The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, 1960. 174 pp., \$3.00.
- Aloysius L. Kuhar. The Conversion of the Slovenes and the German-Slav Ethnic Boundary in the Eastern Alps. New York - Washington: League of C. S. A [c. 1959]. xi, 231.
- Leonid Leonov. The Thief. Tr. Hubert Butler. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1005.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. xvii, 520, \$1.45.
- Clarence A. Manning and Roman Smal-Stocki. The History of Modern Bulgarian Literature. New York: Bookman Associates [c. 1960]. 197 pp., \$4.00.
- Philip E. Mosely. The Kremlin and World Politics: Studies in Soviet Policy and Action. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1002.) New York: Vintage Books, 1960. 557, x, \$1.65.
- Stanley W. Page. The Formation of the Baltic States. (Harvard Historical Monographs, XXXIX.) Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. x, 193, \$4.50.

- Alexei Pisemsky. One Thousand Souls. Tr. Ivy Litvinov. New York: Grove Press, 1959. 472 pp., \$2.95.
- Renato Poggioli. The Poets of Russia, 1890-1930. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1960. xix, 383.
- Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. American Studies in Uralic Linguistics. (Uralic and Altaic Series, I.) Bloomington: Indiana University, 1960. vii, 356, \$4.00.
- Ernest J. Simmons. Leo Tolstoy, I-II. (Vintage Russian Library, R-1001 a-b.). New York: Vintage Books, 1960. xv, 373, xiii; vi, 507, xvi. \$1.45 (each part).
- Denis Sinor. History of Hungary. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. 310 pp., \$5.00.
- Alexander V. Soloviev. Holy Russia: The History of a Religious-Social Idea. (Musagetes, XII.) 'S-Gravenhage, 1959. 61 pp.
- Ivar Specter. The Soviet Union and the Muslim World 1917-1958. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press (distributor), 1959. xii, 328, \$5.00.
- Ina Telberg, comp. Who's Who in Soviet Science and Technology. New York: Telberg Book Co. [c. 1960]. iii, 119 pp.
- Andreas V. Weiss. Hauptprobleme der Zweisprachigkeit: Eine Untersuchung auf Grund deutsch/estnischen Materials. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1959. 214 pp.
- Avrahm Yarmolinsky. Literature Under Communism: The Literary Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin. (Indiana University: Russian and East European Series, 20.) [Bloomington, Ind., n. d.]. vii, 165 pp., \$4.00.

NEWS AND NOTES

Slavic and Slavonic: A Note on Terminology

We in the U. S. are occupied with Slavic studies, while our colleagues in England and Australia and some of our Canadian neighbors are teachers of Slavonic. Both terms, Slavonic and Slavic, have long and honorable histories, and nothing is to be gained by expostulating that one or the other is "better Latin" — we are speaking and writing English. But having two words, why not assign them separate tasks? Given the fact that Slavic is established as the American generic term, could we not agree on a specific sphere of application for Slavonic?

I should like to suggest that we use Slavonic to refer to the most universal of the Slavic languages, the medium of ritual and prayer in Slavic churches and homes all over the world, i. e., what is generally called Church Slavonic (or Slavic). It is a language which has its own history, its own literature, its own traditions, and its own variant forms. Bibliographical classifications can introduce as many sub-headings under Slavonic as needed. When the term has this specific meaning, we can without ambiguity state easily that, for example, the Serbian Slavonic in use for several centuries was replaced by Russian Slavonic in the eighteenth century, or that the Kievan variety of Slavonic was transplanted to Moscow at the time of Nikon.

Old Slavonic (or Old Church Slavonic) should surely be used exclusively for the language of the small number of manuscripts in the oldest known form of written Slavic. Thus discussions of such topics as the interplay of native East Slavic and borrowed South Slavic in the Russian vocabulary from the twelfth to the twentieth century will speak of Slavonic elements (or Church Slavonic if ambiguity is feared, but please not Old!).

Horace G. Lunt
Harvard University

[Professor Lunt in a letter also suggests that there should be agreement in the field about whether to say Slavist or Slavicist. The Journal uses only the form Slavist. It seems to us that there are several terminological problems which should be settled, as Professor Lunt suggests, in American usage. — Ed.]

AATSEEL Chapter Meetings

California Chapter. A luncheon meeting of the California chapter was held on March 19, 1960, at the Men's Faculty Club,

University of California at Berkeley. Ludmilla Patrick, chapter president, was chairman. Evelyn Bristol, Univ. of California, presented a summary of the December meetings of the AATSEEL and MLA Slavic sections in Chicago. Richard W. Leland, secretary-treasurer of the California Chapter, presented a regional report, as given at the Chicago convention, as a member of the AATSEEL Committee for the Promotion of Russian and Other Slavic and East European Languages in the American Secondary Schools.

A committee was established for the Promotion of Russian and Other East European Languages in the California Secondary Schools. Members include: James A. Garvey, Acalanes High School, Lafayette; Robert Stern, San Leandro Public Schools; Capt. W. G. Michelet, USN (Ret.), Menlo School and College, Menlo Park; Helen S. Merrick, San Leandro Public Schools; and A. G. Clark, Mount Diablo Unified School District, Lafayette. A second committee was established for the Promotion of Russian and Other East European Languages in Institutions of Learning Other than the Secondary School, and includes Jack Posin, Stanford Univ.; Oleg Maslenikov, Univ. of California; M. Samilov, Univ. of California; and Luis G. Ireland, Univ. of California (Davis).

A second meeting of the California Chapter was held at the Santa Rosa Conference of the Foreign Language Association of Northern California on April 23-24, 1960. Prof. Patrick presided. Prof. Maslenikov presented a paper, "Foreign Borrowings in the Russian Language."

Connecticut Chapter. The Connecticut Chapter met at Yale University, New Haven, on May 14, 1960. In the first of the papers, "Language and Literature," Robert L. Jackson, Yale Univ., demonstrated the advantages of reading a literary masterpiece in the original, by showing shortcomings in Russian translations from English literature and vice versa. Dr. William S. Cornyn, Yale Univ., in "Language Teaching and the Linguist," emphasized that teaching language should utilize the advances of descriptive linguistics and emphasize the spoken language. R. Rozdestvensky next led an eighth grade Russian class at Glastonbury Public Schools through a series of rapid-fire Russian pattern drills. Nelson Brooks, Yale Univ., read a paper on "The Need of Learning All Language Skills"; he emphasized language for direct communication "by sound, which requires a listener, a speaker, and a situation."

At the business meeting, the following officers of the Connecticut Chapter of the AATSEEL were elected for 1960-61: Olga Svetlik, Univ. of Bridgeport, president; Alexander Schenker, Yale Univ., vice president; and William Mara, Stamford High School, secretary-treasurer.

Florida Chapter. The Florida Chapter met on April 22, 1960, in conjunction with the Florida Education Association Convention in the Seville Hotel, Miami Beach. In addition to acting as chairman, Eva Friedl, Univ. of Miami, read a paper, "Anton Čexov: To the Hundredth Anniversary of His Birth." Daniel A. Zaret, Rollins Coll., spoke on "The Need for a Summer Institute of Languages in Florida." Michael A. Negrich, Guidance Counsellor and teacher of Russian at North Miami

Senior High School, reported, for the AATSEEL Committee for Promoting the Study of Russian in Secondary Schools, on NDEA summer institutes. Berthold C. Friedl, Univ. of Miami, spoke on "Russian in the World of Sciences" and outlined the fields of Russian science and technology for which documentation is available at the University of Miami. Florida AATSEEL members and guests next reported on their successes and problems in teaching in their schools.

Resolutions passed at the meeting included one expressing the hope that financial support from private foundations or from government sources will be forthcoming for materializing the two following projects: (1) the establishment of a Russian Science Research Center, and (2) the establishment of a state Summer Institute of Languages and Scientific Studies. The following officers were elected: Eva Friedl, president; Theodore Conce-vitch, Manatee Coll., and Grace Dupre Brown, Miami Beach Senior High School, vice presidents; Virginia Williamson, Miami Jackson High School, treasurer; Robert H. MacDonald, Wm. Jennings Bryan Elementary School, recording secretary; and Mr. Negrich, secretary.

Illinois Chapter. The Illinois Chapter met at Roosevelt Univ. at 11 a.m. on May 7, 1960. Fruma Gottschalk, Univ. of Chicago, reported on the Conference on Russian Language Materials held at the University of Michigan, February 12-14, 1960.

Indiana Chapter. The spring meeting of the Indiana Chapter was held in conjunction with the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association at Indiana Central Coll., Indianapolis, on April 23. A paper "Textbooks for Beginning Russian" was read by Morton Benson, Ohio Univ. W. B. Edgerton, Indiana Univ., showed a thirty-minute film of a live class during the Russian Workshop in summer 1959, demonstrating the audio-linguistic method of teaching Russian and of introducing new grammatical forms without recourse to English in a beginning course. J. T. Shaw, Indiana Univ., chapter president, chaired the meeting.

New England Chapter. The New England Chapter held its annual meeting on April 30 at the Radcliffe Graduate Center. Valerie Tumins, Chapter president, was chairman. Papers given included "Czesław Miłosz as Émigré Writer," Wiktor Weintraub, Harvard Univ.; "Some Aspects of Russian Technical and Scientific Terminology," Victor Litwinowicz, McGill Univ.; and "Russian and Old Church Slavonic," Boris Unbegaun, Oxford Univ. During the business meeting, Leon Twarog, national president of the AATSEEL, spoke of the membership drive now in progress throughout the country.

New York — New Jersey Regional Chapter. The annual spring conference of the New York — New Jersey Regional Chapter was held at the Loeb Center of New York Univ. on May 21. In the morning, there was a demonstration of the university's language laboratory, under the guidance of Aron Pressman and his staff, including Zoya Yurieff and Andrew Kodjak. The afternoon meeting was chaired by Albert Parry, Colgate Univ., chapter president. It opened with a welcome address

by Germaine Brée, Head of the All-University Department of Romance Languages and Literatures. The meeting was devoted to two themes. Theme I, Russian in Secondary Schools, included a report, "Problems and Prospects," by Helen B. Yakobson, George Washington Univ.; and a report, "One School's Experience," Millard J. Smith, principal of Shaker High School, Newtonville, N. Y., followed by a class demonstration of Russian I and II, by Thomas D. Bushallow, Instructor of Russian in the school. Two papers were given in Theme II, Russian for Adults: "Russian in the Adult Programs of New Jersey," Ludmilla B. Turkevich, Princeton Univ. and Douglass Coll.; and "Language Instruction for Business, Professional, and Industrial Purposes," Fedor I. Nikanov, Managing Director of Language Guild Institute, New York City. Nine publishers provided fine exhibits of textbooks and teaching aids.

[Note: Prof. Parry reports that a total of \$425, for 85 AATSEEL members, has been forwarded to the national secretary-treasurer since last October. He wonders whether any other chapter has done so well. — Ed.]

Ohio Chapter. The annual meeting of the Ohio Chapter was held at Kent State University on April 30. In the business session, the following officers for 1960-61 were elected: Frank R. Silbajoris, Oberlin Coll., president; Branko A. Yirka, St. Edward High School, Cleveland, secretary-treasurer. Gabe Saunders, Univ. of Akron, who recently visited Russia with a group of American educators, gave a lecture illustrated with slides on "Education in the U. S. S. R." A demonstration class in elementary Russian (fourth and sixth grades), taught by Nicholas Pahl, Kent State Univ., presented a dramatized story, recitations, and songs. Justina D. Epp, Ohio State Univ., led a discussion on "Russian in Ohio Secondary Schools." It was decided that Prof. Epp, co-ordinator of Russian in Ohio High Schools, should select two members to serve on a committee to prepare final examinations for the first and second year of high school Russian.

Oklahoma Chapter. On March 6, 1960, the Inaugural Meeting of the Oklahoma Chapter of AATSEEL was held in Stillwater, Oklahoma. Phillip Duncan of Oklahoma State Univ. presided. During the business session the following officers were elected for a six months' period: President — Mrs. Flossie Grogan, Ada Junior High School; vice-president — Mrs. Wayne Edmister, Oklahoma State Univ.; and secretary-treasurer — Herta Herglotz, Univ. of Oklahoma.

The program, arranged by Dr. Duncan, consisted of the following papers: "The Poetry of Mixail Isakovskij," Dr. Herglotz; "Russian: An Exemplification within the Framework of Bio-Linguistic Analysis," Carl Chambers, Oklahoma State Univ.; "A Symbolic Figure in *Dr. Zhivago*," by Prof. Duncan; "Soviet Poetry in 1959: Survey and Commentary," Robert Vlach, Univ. of Oklahoma. The program was concluded by a discussion of the subject "Teaching Russian in the Secondary Schools" by Mrs. Flossie Grogan and Mrs. Wayne Edmister.

Oregon Chapter. The Oregon Chapter met at Reed College, Portland, at 1 p. m. on May 14. In the business meeting, Vera Krivoshein, Reed Coll., was re-elected president, and R. E. Steussy, Univ. of Oregon, and Loretta Wollett, Cleveland High

School, Portland, were re-elected vice presidents; Maxine E. Cooper, Willamette Univ., was elected secretary-treasurer, to replace Marvin E. Weinberger, Reed Coll., who is leaving the state. Prof. Steussy was elected representative for Spectrum. The meeting concluded with a paper by Prof. Steussy on Doktor Živago.

Other Professional Meetings

In the Slavic Languages Sections of the University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, Lexington, April 29-30, 1960, the following papers were read: Friday, April 29, 9 a.m., with William R. Schmalstieg, Lafayette Coll., presiding, "Raiko Alexiev: A Bulgarian Humorist," Albert M. Ivanoff, Univ. of Miami; "Folk-Tales in the Works of Russian Writers," Tatiana Sklanczenko, Indiana Univ.; "The Inspector General — Offstage," Louis A. Pedrotti, Univ. of California; "How Much Does Dostoevskij Lose in English Translation?" Victor Terras, Univ. of Illinois; and "Cexov Production in New York: The Directors' Problems," Philip Bordinat, Miami Univ. Abraham Kreusler, Randolph-Macon Women's College, presided over the afternoon session, which began at 2 p.m., and included the following papers: "A Morphological Marker of the Determinative Aspect in Early Common Slavic," Professor Schmalstieg; "Computer Analysis of Russian Morphology," Lawrence G. Jones, Harvard Univ.; "Teaching Russian on TV," Helen B. Yakobson, George Washington Univ.; "Tradition and Russian Grammar," Thomas F. Magner, Pennsylvania State Univ.; "Some Libraries in Leningrad," Mrs. Hammond Dugan, Univ. of Kentucky; and "A Hebrew Treasure House in the U.S.S.R. Revisited," Abraham I. Katsch, New York Univ.

The Saturday, April 30, session began at 9 a.m., with Rubin Gotesky, Univ. of Georgia, presiding. It included the following papers: "A History of St. Louis of Moscow: A Study in Religious Freedom Yesterday and Today," A. Antonio Laberge, A.A., Assumption Coll.; "Vladimir Soloviev and Bishop Strossmayer," Ante Kadić, Indiana Univ.; "Is Doktor Živago a Religious Book?" G. J. E. Sullivan, Univ. of Dayton; "Pasternak's Živago: A Quest for Self-Realization," J. W. Dyck, Waterloo Univ. Coll.; "Pasternak's View of Life in Doktor Živago," William W. Langebartel, Temple Univ.; "Non-Committed Protagonists in Post-Revolutionary Russian Novels," Jeannette H. Eilenberg, Brooklyn Coll.; "Recent Soviet Translations of Western Fiction," Wacław Jędrzejewicz, Ripon Coll.; "Along the Volga with Folk Song and Dance," Sister Maria Thecla, S. C., and Sacred Heart High School Russian Students, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Slavic Section organizer was Robert Moore.

The Slavic Section of the Central States Modern Language Teachers Association annual meeting was held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, on May 7, 1960, beginning at 2 p.m. Felix J. Oinas, Indiana Univ., was chairman, and Hugh McLean, Univ. of Chicago, acting secretary. The papers read included "Puškin's Vystrel," J. T. Shaw, Indiana Univ.; "Turgenev's

Trial Reopened," Zbigniew Folejewski, Univ. of Wisconsin; "The Prefix *po* and the Slavic Verbal Aspects," Victor Terras, Univ. of Illinois; and "Machine Translation of Russian," Harry H. Josselson, Wayne State Univ. Officers elected for 1961 were Prof. Folejewski, chairman, and Prof. Terras, secretary.

Programs Including Russian Language Study Tours

Russian Language Study tours were given for college credit for the first time in the U.S., to our knowledge, in summer 1960. Indiana University and the University of Michigan have each given an intensive eight-week Russian program on the third-year level, followed by a four-week Russian Language Study Tour to the Soviet Union. The Carnegie Corporation made partial scholarships competitively available for undergraduates in these tours, on the basis of merit and need.

The Indiana University Russian Workshop also sponsored an additional program including a language study tour. Students took a special fourth-year level course in the Russian Workshop and then took a four-week Russian Language Study Tour. The Russian Workshop could supply no scholarships for this advanced tour.

The programs for the language study tours required students to pledge to speak only Russian during the course and also in the Soviet Union. They received four semester hours of college credit for the tour, in addition to credit received for the courses at Indiana and Michigan.

American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies

The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, originally founded in 1948 to publish the American Slavic and East European Review, is being transformed into an active membership organization. The AAASS will have four main functions: (1) sponsorship of a revised and enlarged quarterly journal, to be edited by Donald Treadgold, Univ. of Washington, to emphasize study of the area as a whole and multi-disciplinary analysis of the societies and cultures involved (the first issue is to come out in spring 1961); (2) co-operation in distribution of an annual American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies, now edited by J. T. Shaw, and published by the Russian and East European Series of Indiana Univ.; (3) sponsorship of a biennial professional meeting with substantive and business sessions; (4) publication of a newsletter and establishment of a secretariat to maintain address lists and an employment register. For further information, one should write AAASS, 331 Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

The AAASS should have a comparable relationship to the AATSEEL from one point of view that the Modern Language Association, the Modern Language Teachers Association, and the linguistic and folklore societies do, from others. Members of the AATSEEL would profit by joining any or all of these

associations. The AAASS and the new (or reorganized) journal can help AATSEEL members to be more cognizant of what other researchers in the same geographical field are doing and to help with multi-disciplinary synthesis. Individuals who are members both of the AATSEEL and the AAASS will receive not only the annual American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies, but two additional books published by the Indiana University Russian and East European Series.

Michigan Inter-University Committee for the Advancement of Russian and East European Studies

The Michigan Inter-University Committee for the Advancement of Russian and East European Studies was established at a meeting of a group of specialists representing many departments and colleges of five state universities of Michigan, at a meeting held at Wayne State Univ. on April 29-30. Fred E. Dohrs, Wayne State Univ., was named chairman; and a council was set up, including Deming Brown, Univ. of Michigan; Charles D. Kenney, Michigan State Univ.; Edythe Mange, Western Michigan Univ.; and Richard Wysong, Central Michigan Univ. Topics discussed at the meeting included: problems facing Russian and East European Studies in Michigan schools; bibliography and library holdings for Russian and East European studies; visual aids and other materials for Russian and East European studies; and Russian and East European language training and teaching. Sub-committees were set up on language, bibliography, inter-university survey courses, audio-visual materials, monographs, and on information and requirements. Meetings are already scheduled for October 1960 and spring 1961.

A program among the colleges of Indiana, entitled the Project for Extending the Study of Foreign Areas in Indiana Undergraduate Education (including the Russian and East European areas), was set up in 1959; its advisory board consists of representatives from fourteen Indiana colleges and universities. Are there other states in which already exist inter-university committees to sponsor study of the Russian and East European area or areas in general including this one?

Honors

The American Council of Learned Societies has conferred upon Roman Jakobson, Harvard Univ., a prize of \$10,000 with the citation: "Roman Jakobson — restless conquistador of the jungled frontiers of linguistic and literary scholarship; pioneer both as zealous organizer and as scholarly exemplar in the establishment of Slavic literary studies throughout the world; internationally honored critic of many literatures, in many works, who writes in many languages . . . and who, in these studies, vivifies linguistics, sharpens poetics, and deepens our understanding of the literary imagination." In February, Prof. Jakobson received a diploma of full membership in the

Polish Academy of Sciences, and this June he was to receive the degree of D. Litt. from Cambridge Univ.

Renato Poggioli has been given the title of Curt Hugo Reisinger Professor of Slavic and Comparative Literature at Harvard Univ. He has been appointed Bacon Exchange Professor to France, to teach at the Faculté de Lettres of the University of Paris in the Spring of 1961.

Publications

The following publications of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare are of especial interest:

Patricia O'Connor, Modern Foreign Languages in High School: Pre-Reading Instruction. Bulletin OE-27000, No. 9, 1960. 25¢ College as well as high school teachers can profit by it.

Marjorie C. Johnston and Esther M. Eaton, Source Materials for Secondary School Teachers of Foreign Languages, Revised edition. OI-27001, Circular No. 509, Revised, Jan. 1960. 20¢

Nellie Apanasewicz and William K. Medlin, Selected Bibliography of Materials on Education in Poland. OE-14030. Feb. 1960.

Anon. "Textbooks for Russian Schools," Information on Education Around the World, No. 3 (Revised), June 1960, OE-14034-3.

These publications are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

The June 1960 issue of The Atlantic was devoted to the arts in the Soviet Union.

The Role of Linguistics and Linguistic Analysis in Programs Under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

A Statement by the Committee on Language Programs,
American Council of Learned Societies

Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 calls explicitly for the improvement of foreign language teaching by training teachers in "the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials." It also mentions linguistics as a field in which individuals may need training in order to achieve the objectives of the Act.

The Committee on Language Programs, a continuation of a committee established by the American Council of Learned Societies in 1942 to aid in the development of foreign language training programs in the military services during World War II, and subsequently reorganized in 1946 to assist in various civilian language teaching endeavors, wishes to go on record as expressing its satisfaction at the fact that in passing the National

Defense Education Act the Congress appeared to recognize the potentially important role of modern linguistic science in the improvement of language teaching.

It further wishes to make note of the manner in which the U. S. Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has addressed itself to the task of implementing the provisions of Title VI. The Committee is pleased that the Language Development Section of that Office has demonstrated its readiness to support experimentation in the application of structural linguistics to foreign language teaching.

Among the actions taken by the U. S. Office of Education with which we are particularly gratified we may cite the following:

- (1) the strong encouragement given to language institutes to incorporate the teaching of linguistics and linguistic analysis as an essential part of their programs;
- (2) the requirements and specifications laid down for language and area centers which give prominence to linguistic research as a tool in language study;
- (3) the awarding of contracts calling for the preparation of contrastive linguistic analyses for several important languages; and
- (4) the support given the Modern Language Association in its desire to assure the qualification of language teachers in those aspects of linguistic analysis which are relevant to language teaching methodology.

The Committee hopes that these and similar actions will be continued and strengthened in the further implementation of the National Defense Education Act.

Some of the more important ways in which foreign language teaching can be aided by linguistic science are these:

(1) The scientific analysis of the language to be taught. Above all, the teacher of a foreign language will be aided by a knowledge of what linguistic analysis shows about the language he is teaching. Linguistic analysis seeks to be able to specify, in the greatest precision and detail one may desire:

- (a) the system of mutually contrasting basic sounds (phonemes) which operate in the language, together with the conditions under which these sounds appear in variant forms and the ways in which the sounds compose syllables and words;
- (b) the grammar of the language, stated not in traditional terms of Western philosophy but in terms of the system of form classes, inflections, constructions, sentence-types, and grammatical rules which actually function in the language as determined by the analysis of utterances;
- (c) the system of meanings embodied in the vocabulary of the language, and which are specific to that language, and
- (d) the various forms, levels, and dialects of a language and the circumstances under which they are used.

(2) The study of the contrasts between the learner's native language and the language being learned. Scientific linguistics

can isolate and draw attention to the specific items in a language which are most dissimilar to corresponding items in the learner's native language and which will hence be likely to demand more attention and effort in teaching. In order to do this, linguists have recently turned their attention to the careful analysis of the English language as well as foreign languages.

(3) The study of the physiology of sound production in the context of the significant features of the language. The teacher will be aided by a knowledge of certain relevant essentials of the science of articulatory phonetics, which is a part of the general area of linguistics, but even more by a knowledge of the relation between phonetics and phonemics. Scientific linguistics has shown that pronunciation drills in isolation and divorced from the functioning system of a language are useless if not actually harmful.

(4) The study of the writing system and its relation to the spoken language. Just as linguistic analysis can study the system of sounds employed in a language, it can also study the system of writing and its relation to the sounds which it is supposed to represent. It can provide accurate information on the features of a writing system and hence supply orderly guides for the learner.

(5) Considerations of the nature of language. The specific contributions of linguistic science in this area can be stated in terms of a very few generalizations of far-reaching importance. Perhaps the most influential of these is the following: language as a form of human communication characteristically exists as a system of spoken communication and only derivatively as a system of written communication; for general purposes of language learning, therefore, the spoken language — auditory comprehension and oral production — should be given first consideration.

It has been, and will be said, of course, that many teachers of foreign languages are able to achieve good results without the explicit aid of the various kinds of linguistic knowledge outlined here. This may very well be true, but we believe that a careful consideration of the bases of successful teaching will reveal that it can often be traced to a kind of "native wisdom" or intuitive grasp of the very facts and attitudes taught by linguistic science, combined with the use of teaching materials which have indeed been influenced by the findings of linguistic science.

In any case, we are persuaded that foreign language teaching can be very significantly aided by explicit use of the best linguistic knowledge. On these grounds, we trust that the implementation of the National Defense Education Act will continue to accord due recognition to the role of linguistic science in all activities pertaining to the furtherance of better language teaching.

March 1960

Committee on Language Programs,
American Council of Learned Societies

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Published by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SLAVIC
AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

The Slavic and East European Journal, a periodical devoted to research in language, linguistics, and literature, and to pedagogy, is the official publication of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, AATSEEL of the U. S., Inc., an affiliate of the Modern Language Association of America, the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, and the Canadian Association of Slavists and East European Specialists. This publication journal is the successor to The AATSEEL Journal and The AATSEEL Bulletin. The Journal is published quarterly through the facilities of Indiana University.

Subscription to The Slavic and East European Journal is \$5.00 per year for individuals, libraries, and institutions. The subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL. A special rate of \$2.00 per year has been set for undergraduate and graduate students. Single copies may be purchased for \$1.50.

Applications for membership, subscriptions to the Journal, and all other business letters should be sent to the Executive Secretary and Treasurer: Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, manuscripts, exchange journals, and copy for advertisements should be sent to J. T. Shaw, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

The printed order of articles does not imply relative merit. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the editorial staff.